DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 027 HE 006 961

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Kellams, Samuel E. |
| TITLE | Emerging Sources of Student Influence. ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 5, 1975. |
| INSTITUTION | George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. |
| SPONS AGENCY | National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. |
| REPORT NO | RR-5 |
| PUB DATE | 75 |
| NOTE | 63p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($3.00, Orders under $15.00 must be prepaid) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage |
| DESCRIPTORS | Collective Bargaining; Colleges; College Students; Costs; Court Cases; Decision Making; Governance; *Higher Education; *Political Influences; *Political Power; Student Participation; *Student Rights; *Students; Universities |

ABSTRACT

While students have become more sophisticated in their modes of political influence, their interests since 1970 have become delimited to concerns that affect their lives the most--the cost of their education. They also remain concerned about issues of freedom and participation in campus decision making. While these newly emerging sources of influence are potentially quite effective, students have met with a number of barriers, both on and off the college campus. The sources of influence seem to have taken two routes: students organizing separately or students participating in already existing structures and processes. The evolution of sources of influence seems to be toward more student extra-institutional political activity where students may have an advantage at this time. Student extra-institutional political activity has been used directly to gain specific ends (like more financial aid appropriations) but, perhaps more importantly, indirectly to gain influence through permanent and legitimate participation in the ongoing institutional decision-making processes. (Author/KE)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED114027

# Emerging Sources of Student Influence

Samuel E. Kellams

ERIC/Higher Education
Research Report No. 5
1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared by the
ERIC Clearinghouse
on Higher Education
The George Washington University
Washington, D. C. 20036

Published by
the American Association
for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 780
Washington, D. C. 20036

HE006961

*This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association for Higher Education for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions do not, however, necessarily represent official views or opinions of either the American Association for Higher Education or the National Institute of Education.*

## Acknowledgement

I wish to take this opportunity to acknowledge the assistance of Ms. Sylvia Honke and Mr. Dwight Wolf, graduate students in the Center for Higher Education, who helped in the literature search over the past year.

Samuel E. Kellams

## Already Published in the Series

1. Educational Auditing and Voluntary Institutional Accrediting
   *Fred F. Harcleroad and Frank G. Dickey*

2. Academic Credit for Prior Off-Campus Learning
   *David A. Trivett*

3. Rationales for Experiential Education
   *Robert F. Sexton and Richard A. Ungerer*

4. Federal Laws: Nondiscrimination and Faculty Employment
   *Carol Herrnstadt Shulman*

*To subscribe to the complete series of 1975 reports (10 issues), write to the Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D. C. 20036. The subscription rate for AAHE members is $15, for nonmembers $25. Single issues are available at $3 per copy.*

## 1974 Reports Still Available

The "Benefits Crisis" in Higher Education
*Oscar T. Lenning*

Proprietary Schools and Postsecondary Education
*David Trivett*

How Much Change for a Dollar? A Look at Title III
*Harold L. Hodgkinson*

Higher Education and the Steady State
*Larry L. Leslie and Howard F. Miller, Jr.*

The Personalized System of Instruction: An Educational Alternative
*Robert S. Ruskin*

Faculty Workload: Facts, Myths and Commentary
*Harold E. Yuker*

Trends in Education for the Professions
*G. Lester Anderson*

Time Shortened Degrees
*Charles W. Meinert*

Private Colleges: Present Conditions and Future Prospects
*Carol Herrnstadt Shulman*

College Trustees: A Question of Legitimacy
*J. L. Zwingle and William V. Mayville*

*Copies of any of the titles listed above are available for $3 each. To order, write to the Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D. C. 20036. Payment must accompany all orders under $15.*

## Foreword

This study examines the newly emerging sources of student influence from 1970 to the present. The focus is basically on political sources and includes "old-style" protest, lobbying, student-run cooperatives, student participation in governance, collective bargaining, and the student as full citizen and full adult. While students have become more sophisticated in their modes of influence, their interests since 1970 have become delimited to concerns that affect their lives the most—the costs of their education. They are also concerned about issues of their own freedom and their participation in campus decision making. The author, Samuel E. Kellams, is assistant professor of education at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

Peter P. Muirhead, Director
ERIC/Higher Education

## Contents

**Overview** 1
**Introduction** 3
Methodology and Scope of the Study 4
**Students as a Separate Political Force** 5
Student Protest and Confrontation Revisited 5
Student Lobbying 9
Student Institutions 19
**Student Participation in Established Political Structures and Processes** 27
Student Participation in Campus Governance 27
Collective Bargaining and College Students 28
Students as Citizens and Adults 37
**Conclusion** 46
**Bibliography** 50

## Overview

The year 1970 seems to have been a watershed for the ways in which college students exercise influence. Most people were familiar with the growth of "student protest" activities on campuses that extended through the spring of 1970. Both journalists and academicians gained reputations in covering and interpreting what appeared at that time to be a highly significant, worldwide movement. Many people were entertained, some were bored, and others were outraged. Whatever the particular posture people took, most thought that "student protest" was over after 1970 and that students had returned to their former quiescent state. This is because researchers, writers, and broadcasters have not done as well since 1970 in tracing the less spectacular ways in which students gain their ends. It is the premise of this study that students continue to try to influence the course of events in the wider society and on their campuses. However, the sources from which they derive influence are less spectacular and it is more difficult to identify and assess the nature and effectiveness of these sources.

This study explores some newly emerging sources of student influence. The use of the word "power" in relation to students has been purposely avoided. "Student power" was a catch phrase during the late 1960's and has a variety of meanings. For this study the word "influence" is used in the way that most people understand: to affect or alter by indirect or intangible means, to sway or to modify. A source of influence, then, is a mechanism, process, or situation that enables a person to affect, alter, sway, or modify something in a basically indirect way. The task here is to identify and discuss the mechanisms, processes, or situations that permit college students to influence the issues that matter to them.

Sources of student influence can be classified as political, legal, and other sources. The primary focus in this study will be upon the newly emerging political sources of influence. These political sources have been grouped for the purpose of analysis into two broad categories that form the organizing framework for the study. The first category views students operating as a separate political force. This includes "old style" student protest, student lobbying activities, and the operation of new student institutions. The second category views students as participating in established political structures and

processes. Included here are student participation in governance, collective bargaining, and participation as full citizens and full adults.

In each of these subcategories the nature of the sources of influence are described and cases are given where sources have been used by students. Also barriers to full use of these sources of influence are identified and a rough assessment of the real and potential effectiveness of these sources is made. In addition, the interrelationship of these various sources of influence is considered in terms of how they reinforce, complement and in some cases conflict with each other.

The most difficult task is assessing effectiveness. There are some examples and scattered evidence where one can see clear connections between a source of influence (i.e., student lobbying) and the ends to which the influence was directed. Even in these cases it is difficult to isolate all of the other contributing factors that might have brought about the particular "end." For example, in the case of student lobbying, bills are passed for a multitude of reasons, only one of which might be student support. Thus, the question of how effective students really have been in using their newer sources of influence remains an empirical problem and one that cannot be resolved in this study.

The basic conclusion of this study is that students have developed and are drawing from a number of newer sources of influence. These sources represent a logical evolution from the all-or-nothing days of direct confrontation to the more multifaceted, less disruptive, and more sophisticated political approaches used by college students in areas that vitally affect their lives.

## Introduction

Although the academic wars that began in the 1960's have subsided, and "student activism" no longer captures the headlines of daily newspapers, college students continue to influence colleges and universities and the wider society. Although many sources of influence used by students in the past are still effective today there are some newly emerging sources that are potent mechanisms for students to influence aspects of society and institutions of higher education that matter to them. This paper will focus chiefly on these emerging, basically political sources of influence.

Generally, sources of student influence may be classified as political, legal, and other. There are two conceptually different ways in which students draw upon political sources to gain their ends. One involves students acting as a separate political force, essentially on their own. Some examples are traditional student government, student protest and confrontation, student unionism (on the European model), student lobbying at all levels of government, student-staffed Public Interest Research Groups (PIRGs) and other student-initiated and/or student-operated, cooperative economic, educational, and cultural institutions. Another way students use political sources is by participating in established (nonstudent or adult) political processes and decision-making structures. This includes shared participation in the formal governance of colleges and universities, participation in various phases of collective bargaining between faculty members and administrators, and extra-institutional political participation as voters and adult members of society.

Legal sources of influence used by students have included litigation all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States. Frequently, the courts are used by students in attempts to establish their right to exercise influence by political means. In this way the courts operate as an "intermediate" or "mediating" source of student influence. Although it is beyond the scope of this study to comprehensively document the ways in which students use the legal machinery, student use of the courts will be illustrated where it is directly related to the various political sources of influence discussed.

Other sources of influence revolve around the student's role as the consumer of a product in the educational market. Students are scarce and are highly valued by colleges for economic reasons. Education is

plentiful, but costly, and may be devalued in part for economic reasons. Again, this particular topic would require separate treatment to adequately tease out the implications for student influence. In this study it is sufficient to recognize that the market for recruiting and holding students makes it all the more likely that direct, political sources of student influence will be effective.

*Methodology and Scope of the Study*

This study will explore the "post-activist" sources of student influence, or the period from 1970 to the present (summer 1975). Examples come chiefly from four-year colleges and universities, although some of the analysis is applicable to all postsecondary education.

Materials are drawn from the journal literature, books and monographs, literature listed in the ERIC system, newspaper items, and other reports and documents procured directly from student-run agencies. References are made to the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (*CHE*) as a source of primary factual material, for examples of the kinds of issues students are addressing, and for sources from which they seek to influence matters important to them. No attempt is made to undertake exhaustive surveys, to list all the cases known, or to assess the number of students or institutions involved in a given source of influence.

Where the data permit, some attempt is made to assess the effectiveness and potential effectiveness of the sources of influence. The author has tried to avoid value statements as to whether students *should* be influential or not, and whether the results of their influence are good or bad.

## Students as a Separate Political Force

Perhaps the best known way in which students have acted as a separate political force has been traditional, campus-based student government. Traditional separation-of-power models of student government grew rapidly during the 1920's and 1930's spurred on by the student personnel movement of the time. Up to the 1960's student government was largely confined to social matters, such as the selection of homecoming queens and school songs (Hodgkinson 1971, p. 41-42). On other matters students served in an advisory or consultative capacity at the initiative and under the watchful direction of the office of the dean of students.

Separate student governments still exist at most colleges. It is probably fair to say that such traditional forms of influence are most viable where: issues involve matters of personal, economic, and academic concern to the student constituency; faculties and administrators are receptive to student concerns and student input; and other sources of influence (such as student protest and student lobbying) have been used in complementary ways. Even so, there are many colleges where students are not convinced that their governance structures have been effective. At Ohio University, for example, the student governing board voted to disband and called their function a cruel political farce. They complained of having no real power and felt that their recommendations to the administration had been ignored (*CHE*, May 12, 1975, p. 2).

*Student Protest and Confrontation Revisited*

It is now over a decade since the first wave of mass student protest caught the public eye. And it is now more than five years since the turbulence on the campuses is presumed to have ceased. Actually, the episodes of student protest are not nearly so rare in our nation's history as the popular media suggest. Campus protest activity reached very high levels during the 1930's and began to build rapidly again during the late 1950's and early 1960's (Altbach 1974, p. 8). And campus protest did not end with the tragedies of Jackson State and Kent State in 1970.

During the period from 1964 to 1970 students rediscovered, further developed, and legitimized a whole host of tactics and strategies to influence issues that concerned them. These tactics were largely

campus-based, but clearly beyond the established governance structures and traditional campus decision-making apparatus, and included demonstrations, such as marches, rallies, vigils, sit-ins, occupation of buildings and offices, strikes, boycotts and moratoria; placarding, picketing, petitioning and pamphleteering; and riots, intimidation, disruption of classes, violence, sabotage, destruction, and terrorism. Aided by the communications media, these tactics became a potent source of student influence.

Eventually, distinctions were made between mechanisms of dissent as constitutionally protected sources of influence and mechanisms of disruption that abridged the constitutional rights of others and jeopardized the educational mission of institutions of higher education (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Dissent and Disruption,* 1971, p. 5-14). The courts served the useful function of interpreting these distinctions in numerous specific cases. One positive outcome of this period of turmoil was that campuses were forced to codify the rules and regulations that define the limits of student protest activity as it relates to legitimate educational goals. This codification had the effect of recognizing the legitimacy of many of these tactics and of preserving them for use by future generations of college students.

Since 1970 students have not been reluctant to use these sources of influence. Unfortunately, comprehensive national surveys of student protest activities are no longer in fashion. The last major survey was reported in 1971 covering the academic year 1970-1971, a year generally thought to be tranquil (Bayer and Astin, 1971). The authors conclude that over 1,000 institutions of higher education experienced protest activity and almost half of these colleges experienced "severe" protests. This level of activity was similar to that in 1968-69, a "banner year" for student protest.

In the absence of comprehensive survey data, one must rely on the reports made public in the news media for examples of continuing student use of confrontation tactics as a source of influence. Some of the more publicized incidents are briefly sketched below.

In the spring of 1973 at Antioch College students locked the buildings of the Yellow Springs, Ohio, campus which prevented other students, faculty members, and administrators from using the campus for six weeks. The strike was initiated chiefly by about 200 low-income and minority students participating in the college's New Directions program. Issues were mainly economic. The students were seeking guarantees from the administration for financial aid packages extending for five years. Because of uncertainties in federal funding and

other institutional financial constraints, the administration could not accommodate these demands. Initial attempts to negotiate with the strikers collapsed and eventually violence and destruction ensued resulting in the expulsion of 19 students and the dismissal of seven faculty members. The strike ended when a group of nonstriking students sought and successfully obtained an injunction from a local court ordering the college to reopen. Police force had to be used to implement the injunction. The administration initially had refused to call the police and had opposed the injunction (Semas, May 21, 1973; May 29, 1973; June 18, 1973).

In September 1973 students at the University of Michigan staged an abortive attempt to withhold payment of their tuition due to a sudden rise in fees averaging 24 percent. Because of an earlier court-directed change in residency rules making it easier for students to establish residency for tuition purposes, the University of Michigan stood to lose several million dollars in revenues. An across-the-board tuition hike was announced about six weeks before classes were to begin. The tuition strike began, with some 5,000 students pledging to withhold their fees. Attempts were made to disrupt fee payment lines and rallies were held. When moderate leadership (the student body president) gave way to more radical, ideological leadership, the strike dwindled within a few weeks and most students paid their tuition. The administration said the strike had little effect, although later in the year tuition rebates were mailed to students when the loss of revenue was not as great as had been predicted (Van Dyne, Nov. 12, 1973).

At Duke University over 600 students protested the proposed phase-out of the School of Forestry and the Primate Research Center. The university had projected a $3.4 million deficit for 1975-76 and students have been seeking a voice in the kinds of cuts to be made (Campus Notes, *CHE*, March 10, 1975, p. 2).

Financial difficulties resulting in a proposed nonrenewal of 52 faculty positions at the University of Maryland was at issue in student protests on the College Park campus. The faculty cuts were to be made at the assistant professor and graduate assistant level. Students argued that these were some of their best teachers and that quality education was under attack due to the particular positions to be cut and the potential increase in the student/faculty ratio. Students and faculty leaders had earlier been effective in lobbying to defeat state legislative attempts to cut an additional 55 teaching positions. In addition, proposed increases were the object of student protest rallies (Becker 1975).

Students at the University of Massachusetts declared a two-day moratorium on classes in a protest against proposed budget reductions by a referendum vote of 8,870 to 1,031. The students were urged to telephone and write parents and legislators to prevent cuts in special programs for minorities, possible increases in tuition and fees, and possible reductions in student employment opportunities on campus (Campus Notes, *CHE*, May 5, 1975). After a 38-hour occpuation of University Hall, black and Latin American students won some concessions from the administration at Brown University. Agreement was gained to increase minority enrollments by 25 percent over the next three years, to increase local black recruiting, and to generally involve blacks in the admission process (Magarrell 1975).

At the Santa Barbara campus of the University of California, 25 student protesters were arrested for staging a three-hour sit-in at the computer center. Issues involved the recruitment of more minority group faculty members and continued funding for black and Chincano studies centers (Campus Notes *CHE*, May 12, 1975, p. 2).

While some of these protest activities have been directly effective and others have not, they are representative of the kinds of "old-style" protest that continues today—but with several differences. First, the issues have clearly changed. Students are concerned with immediate personal, academic, and economic bread-and-butter issues. Tuition hikes, rent increases, program cut-backs, financial aid concerns, and faculty retrenchment—these have been the most salient issues for students in the last several years. That such shifts in the issues would occur is not surprising given the social and political impact of the economic recession. Broader and more abstract issues of war and peace, environmental despoliation, and corporate power have been less often used as rallying-cries for student protest since 1970. The financial difficulties of colleges have been especially threatening for minority group programs and related issues around the country. Commitment to minority programs was a matter chiefly of social justice, idealism, and even institutional pride during the more affluent 1960's. In the 1970's, however, continuation and maintenance of such programs is a matter of money and campus priorities. In a time of no-growth or retrenchment, a "last-on," "first-off" policy may be very tempting.

Another difference in student protest since 1970 involves tactics and strategies. Though some of the same devices are being used, the protest activities appear to be less violent, more orderly, and more constructive. Also, the protest mode is used more selectively, sup-

plementing other sources of influence such as lobbying and collective bargaining.

Students may be moving away from the "protest" as an all-or-nothing device. Instead they want to dramatize and publicize their concerns in order to strengthen their positions through other political, legal and economic channels of influence.

*Student Lobbying*

One of the newly emerging and most promising channels of student influence is student lobbying. Like old-style campus-based student government and student protest, student lobbying is organized by students, supported by students, and operated by students (or recent graduates) in the interests of student constituencies. Unlike earlier sources of influence, student lobbying is almost by definition an off-campus activity. Student lobbying involves the attempt to control matters of vital concern to students through direct influence on the legislative and executive branches of ordinary governmental bodies—local, state, and national. Student lobbyists interact with legislators, mayors, governors, and other executive and legislative agencies by monitoring bills, establishing positions with respect to those bills, and arguing their case on the basis of carefully assembled information. In other words, they work through the system as an organized and registered special interest group.

While student lobbying is not new, it has taken on more sophisticated organizational forms, is better financed, and has narrowed its focus to a slate of rather pragmatic student concerns since 1970. Prompted by the need for a national student voice, the National Student Lobby (NSL) was organized in 1971.[1] The NSL is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that lobbies and testifies in Congress on student-related issues. It is staffed by about nine full-time professionals and student interns and controlled by a board of directors consisting of students from colleges across the country. Its real support comes from the affiliation of student government organizations at hundreds of colleges. When a local student group affiliates with NSL the administrative mechanism is known as a "campus annex." The campus annex is staffed by an annex director and local students all of whom serve as a link between the NSL activities in Washington, D.C., and local campus concerns. Usually a portion of the student activity fee is allocated for membership in the NSL. The NSL publishes *The*

[1] The National Student Lobby is located at 2000 P Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

*National Student Lobby Annex Handbook* to help students organize a NSL campus annex.

During the first year of operation, NSL attracted members from 136 colleges in 37 states (Jacobson 1972, p. 4). By 1973 the NSL had some 220 colleges as dues-paying members, who were usually represented by their individual student government officers (Semas, March 12, 1973, p. 5).

Each year several hundred student leaders come to Washington for a conference, a series of workshops, and more extensive lobbying activities with their congressional representatives. Issues are identified through an annual referendum conducted by NSL through the campus annexes. Members of NSL also receive the bimonthly newsletter, *Student Lobbyist*, which reports on national and state lobbying activities as well as the status of important bills.

NSL's priorities are chiefly the bread-and-butter issues: student financial aid programs, a standard minimum wage for students on a par with others, airfare discounts for students, sex discrimination in higher education, and a continuation of low tuition at public institutions (Semas, March 12, 1973, p. 5; *CHE*, March 4, 1974, p. 4). More recently, NSL legislative concern has focused on emergency employment opportunities for students during the recession, aid to veterans, and a continuation of the right of students to declare bankruptcy (*Student Lobbyist*, Vol. 1, No. 3, April-May, 1975, p. 4).

One visible success for NSL was an amendment to the Higher Education Act of 1972 urging colleges to include students on their governing boards (Van Dyne, October 15, 1974, p. 1, 4). More recently, NSL joined with 25 other national organizations to defend low-cost tuition at public colleges and universities (*CHE*, April 7, 1975, p. 9).

Although NSL is concerned chiefly with federal level issues and activities, it also works with several state lobby groups (not to be confused with "campus annexes") when there are mutual interests. It maintains a file on each of the 28 states that have organized student state lobbying activity, sponsors regional workshops for state groups, has conducted a survey questionnaire of many of the state lobbies, and has produced a manual for use by students who want to establish an effective state lobbying group (the *National Student Lobby State Lobby Handbook*).

At the state level significant developments have taken place in higher education that have affected student lobbying. Recently, public institutions of higher education have formed state systems of higher education, with the administration of these systems centrally

located at the seat of state government. In some cases there are several state systems corresponding to institutional types; for example, the state university system, the state college system, and the state community college system. Often there exists a state council or coordinating agency to mediate, review, and recommend policy on budgetary matters, resource allocation, program and student growth, and overall mission of these several systems. In other cases a statewide governing board—a superboard—controls the entire higher education complex in a given state. In all cases, more centralization has occurred in state capitols. Vital decisions that affect students are being made hundreds of miles from their campuses.

One political response by students to this centralizing trend has been to copy the approach. Students have organized their own state level representatives in the form of state associations of students representing the students within whole systems of state institutions. These associations concentrated heavily on establishing organized lobbying groups with relatively permanent staffs of students and former students turned professional lobbyists. In this way, students seek to institutionalize advocacy for student interests at the highest level of policy making. The problem of rapid turnover of student leaders of campus-based student governments is alleviated and a continuity of student advocacy is gained. This idea seems to be gaining momentum.

State-level student associations have also sponsored a number of services to students, in addition to representing student interests to boards of trustees and administrations at the state level, to the state legislators, to the office of the governor, to state education departments and other executive agencies, and to state coordinating and planning agencies for higher education. Student services include group buying cooperatives, group travel programs, student insurance programs, and statewide booking and development of entertainment for constituent campuses.

This combination of student advocacy and student services on a more centralized state-system basis is similar to the "student union" model common to European universities. The Student Association of the State University of New York (SASU) is really little different from the National Union of Students (NUS) of Great Britain, except for the ideological differences and "radical" overtones of NUS (Scully, May 12, 1975, p. 7). NUS is a federation of 750 unions at local universities, polytechnic institutes, and colleges of Great Britain. Most of these local institutions pay part of their union fee for NUS support. Over 45 full-time employees are involved in advocacy and

services administration. NUS negotiates directly with the government on size and availability of grants to students. It also owns an insurance company and a travel agency that offers a range of services. For example, in 1973-74, 317,000 students used NUS travel bureaus. Most agree that this mode of student influence has been quite effective.

In this country, at least 28 states have full-time organized student lobby groups that are housed and registered at the state capitol. Some states have more than one lobby group representing different student constituencies (California, for example). Little has been written and formally published on these student state lobbies (Van Dyne, October 15, 1974, p. 1; Senia, October 1974, p. 29-33).

Another source is to contact the various student state lobby associations directly. This procedure was used in this study to obtain a wide assortment of materials from student lobbies in California, New York, and Wisconsin. What follows are short case studies of these three states' student lobby efforts. The materials upon which the descriptions and analyses are based include personal communications with the student lobby group spokesmen, news releases, summaries and reports of legislation monitored, student voter registration and voting pattern analyses, documents outlining the organization, authority and powers of the student associations, newsletters produced for the student association campus constituencies, and public relations brochures. Unless directly quoted, these various documents will not be individually referenced.

Students of the nine campuses of the University of California have formed one of the most active and effective lobbies in the country. The Student Lobby was created in 1970 by the Associated Students of the University of California. Student body presidents of the nine campuses, called the Student Body Presidents' Council, serve as the policy-making body for the Student Lobby. The lobby is staffed by three full-time recent graduates who earn about $600 per month and serve up to two-year terms. They are assisted by student interns (nine or ten) who receive expenses, academic credit, and spend at least one term in Sacramento ("The Student Lobbyists," *Time*, Sept. 24, 1973). The Student Lobby represents over 100,000 UC students and is supported by student activities fees at the current rate of about 66 cents per student. Obviously, a budget in excess of $50,000 is involved.

To facilitate working liaisons with the individual campuses, each campus has a Lobby Annex Director whose specific duties include: communicating lobby activities and positions from the state to the local campus ("annex"); communicating campus issues that may be

affected by legislation to the Student Lobby staff; researching topics or issues needed in establishing lobby positions; and helping to select student interns for the Sacramento office. In addition, there are periodic campus referenda that help to determine lobby priorities and goals. This "annex" organization is similar to that used by the National Student Lobby.

During the last couple of years the UC Student Lobby followed over 150 pieces of state legislation, taking active positions on many bills. Of highest priority were bills related to the UC budget, child-care centers, collective bargaining, master planning in higher education, financial aid to students, housing regulations, bills related to student voting rights, and bills directly affecting the system-wide student government association. These legislative areas are typical of the concerns that students are showing for issues directly affecting their own welfare. Some elaboration in these areas will help to illustrate in more concrete terms how the UC Student Lobby functions.

The lobby has become increasingly involved in the budgetary process and has sought to support funding likely to benefit students directly. For example, the lobby was able to convince Governor Reagan to augment the UC budget by $1 million to fund teaching evaluation and small seminar courses. Lobbyists also sought funding for new classroom equipment, increased student use of computers, salary increases for teaching assistants, improvement of library staffing and book circulation, improvement in campus lighting in high crime areas, and effective affirmative action. While many of these items received favorable consideration from the legislature, most did not get by the governor's veto.

Child care centers have been successfully funded through the action of the Student Lobby at the level of $605,000 for 1973-74 and at the same level for 1974-75. Efforts to sponsor bills to greatly increase this support to public colleges on the basis of the number of students enrolled who are also parents has met with little success so far.

Student Lobby concern with bills on collective bargaining stems from the desire to prevent campus government from being conducted without student participation. The many gains students made in the late 1960's under the general heading of "student participation in governance" are being threatened in California, as elsewhere, by new bargaining laws. The Student Lobby sought amendments to bargaining legislation that would permit students, at the very least, to become third-party participant/observers at the negotiating table. The amendments were made but the bills under consideration were never enacted.

Financial aid has been one of the perennial issues of most student lobbies. In California some thirteen bills were monitored in this area over the past two years. The Student Lobby claims credit for diverting $4.1 million from a building construction fund for use as aid to students over a two-year period. Bills were supported to increase funds for state scholarships and to increase the number of state grants for disadvantaged students. A lobby-sponsored bill of particular interest that was passed provides for a Community Service Fellowship Program. This program gives state student financial aid to persons who participate in certain volunteer community service projects, thus supplying incentives for "stopping out" of college while earning the right to student aid when one returns to college.

In the housing area, students have supported legislation reducing the power that landlords have over student tenants. They have sought bans on nonrefundable cleaning deposits, retaliatory eviction, landlord-tenant inventories of rental property and furniture, and interest income on tenants' deposits. However, these measures have met with little legislative success.

The Student Lobby has actively followed and participated in the new master planning activities that led to legislation to abolish the old Coordinating Council on Higher Education and replace it with the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). The students felt that the new commission broadened membership in the statewide agency and gave it a more substantive role. A UC student was appointed to CPEC for a two-year term. The Student Lobby feels it was instrumental in directing attention to the financial aid needs of lower income students during the deliberations on the new master plan.

Periodically, bills are introduced that shift the date of primary elections for reasons of efficiency. Because students live alternately at college and at home, depending upon the academic calendar, some of these bills serve inadvertently to disenfranchise student voters because of registration complications. Five different bills were introduced of this kind and all were opposed and eventually killed. Other bills were introduced that were specifically intended to prevent students from voting. One bill would have changed the voter registration deadline to 49 days (rather than 29 days) before an election, making it difficult for students to register to vote at their new addresses when they returned to campus in the fall. Another bill would have established the voting residency of a college student as that of his parents if the parents claimed the student as a dependent for income tax purposes. These bills, which were obviously designed to

nullify the potential influence of the eighteen year-old vote in college communities, were defeated.

Other interests of the Student Lobby relate to the Associated Students of the University of California itself. Through passage of a state law in 1972 student cooperative bookstores no longer have to pay a local property tax, an exemption enjoyed by many other nonprofit institutions like churches and colleges. At Berkeley alone a savings of $15,000 annually is realized. Finally, the Student Lobby in California and elsewhere must keep a constant vigil for legislative attempts to abridge the use of student activity fees for lobbying purposes. This would destroy the financial base of the organization from which a considerable representation of student interests is gained at the highest levels of decision making.

How effective has the University of California Student Lobby been? It is probably too early to make overall judgments of this kind if, indeed, the influence of lobbies can ever be assessed. The UC Student Lobby, however, is proud to point to a recent survey reported in the *California Journal*, a monthly magazine on state politics, which ranked the UC Student Lobby the twelfth most influential in the state out of 675 registered lobbyists (Wahle 1974). From this article, from the record, and from various comments made by California legislators (widely quoted in the Student Lobby literature), it appears that the image of "student activist" turned "student lobbyist" has been on the increase. The Student Lobby of the University of California believes that providing accurate and complete information to legislators is an effective approach to lobbying. A California student lobbyist was quoted in *Time* magazine as saying:

> . . . people say the campuses are quiet. There are no more protests because they are no longer effective. Listen, you just don't get a million dollars by sitting on the Governor's front lawn. We're just smarter now. (*Time*, Sept. 2, 1973.)

Probably the largest and most elaborately organized state student lobby is the Student Association of the State University of New York (SASU). A professional staff of eight full-time employees and as many student interns are housed in Albany. A budget of about $80,000 is projected for this year. Like the California Student Lobby, SASU is chiefly funded from member campus student associations assessed at the rate of sixty cents per FTE student from mandatory student activity fees. Unlike the California Student Lobby, about 20 percent of the budget is derived from revenue from the consumer services program. At present 25 of 28 campuses of the SUNY system are mem-

bers of SASU. SASU is governed by a delegate assembly, with delegates apportioned to campuses by the number of FTE students enrolled at the member campuses.

SASU has been very active and apparently effective in the legislative monitoring and lobby area (see *The Annual Report*, SASU, October 25, 1974). Through a biweekly report (*SASU Legislative Report*), the central staff kept members informed of 561 bills that pertained to higher education and student-related issues introduced during the 1974 legislative session. The status of these bills, listing of public hearings, and comprehensive studies were communicated to member campuses. Apparently many other persons and agencies have found this publication useful throughout the political and higher education communities of New York State.

SASU's charter and by-laws restricts legislative advocacy only to those issues directly related to higher education or which affect the interests of SUNY students *as students*. Many of the issues and concerns that were of highest priority to SASU were the same as or analogous to the concerns of the UC Student Lobby.

SASU was influential in helping to shape financial aid legislation saving SUNY students money, providing more financial independence from parents, disposing of the need test for guaranteed student loans, and gaining a wider distribution of the award of Regents scholarships. SASU also worked to keep the potential student vote intact by lobbying for absentee balloting when the primary voting date was changed from mid-June to mid-September. Getting students placed on local governing boards of individual campuses occupied much attention but gained only partial success. SASU was also working for the new age-of-majority law changes and managed to ward off several attempts to undercut SASU support via the mandatory student activity fee.

Of particular interest for a statewide student organization is the area of student services. Because of the number of students potentially involved, SASU has organized and is trying to develop student buying cooperatives for student-oriented products like stereos and musical instruments. While SASU has affiliated with some established buying cooperatives, problems exist in getting local dealer participation and student participation. In addition, student life insurance, student personal property insurance, and student tuition term insurance is offered by SASU and underwritten by several firms. A student travel agency and chartering program and centralized statewide entertainment and booking services have been established.

The United Council of the University of Wisconsin Student Gov-

ernments represents another scaled-down model of a student lobby. Ten of thirteen UW-system student governments are members and represent over 100,000 students in the newly merged University of Wisconsin system. The United Council has a budget of about $16,000 annually and draws revenues from student activities fees at the rate of $1,500 per campus. Two or three persons are active in lobbying in Madison, with the president of United Council the chief lobbyist (Spiegel 1974).

The United Council has claimed the following accomplishments: It authored the student section of Governor Lucey's UW-System merger bill that gave students more authority in the governance of the university. It saved dormitory residents $600,000 yearly by getting passage of legislation for eliminating the sales tax on dormitory food. It prevented the state from instituting an additional student "user" fee on all students for athletic facilities. It was the principal proponent of the recently enacted 18-year-old, age-of-majority bill. And it was instrumental in the Regents' decision to allow students to bring alcoholic beverages into the dormitories.

A spokesman of the UW United Council described lobbying "tactics" like this:

> Our principal lobbying tactic, if you could call it that, is to be courteous, polite, honest and straight-forward in presenting our interest to public officials. Using reasoned, logical arguments is often very effective, especially with new young legislators. Even if you can't always get a legislator's vote on every issue, if you can get his respect, you have made a good beginning.

This lobbyist could have been in any of the 28 states. These "tactics" seem to be a far cry from the stridency and irrationality that often characterized the student protest of the late 1960's.

Other statewide student associations that are particularly active and effective in lobbying are found in Illinois, Colorado, and Montana (Henderson 1975). At least five states have two separate statewide student lobbying groups representing different student constituencies, mostly in the public sector. However, there is evidence that students in private colleges are beginning to form statewide lobbying groups. For instance, students in thirteen out of seventeen private colleges of Minnesota are "studying" the idea of lobbying at the state legislature (*CHE*, Oct. 29, 1974, p. 2).

From the above examples, one can formulate a few generalizations about the organization and operation of student state lobbies.

(1) They are organized, registered, permanent groups housed near

the seats of state government that represent the interests of students on the member campuses.

(2) They are student financed and student controlled.

(3) They have a fairly permanent (sometimes professional) staff aided by student interns who often receive academic credit for their work.

(4) They ascertain and reflect the consensus of opinion through polls or referenda on member campuses.

(5) They are nonpartisan organizations, preferring to deal with specific issues that relate to specific student interests. They do not endorse particular candidates and they do not concern themselves with broad or global social and political issues except as these relate to immediate bread-and-butter concerns.

(6) They seek to open channels of communication from the local campuses to the state student organization and, in turn, to the state government agencies and officials.

(7) At the state level they work not only with legislative lobbying, but also with the executive branch of government, state departments of education, state coordinating councils for higher education, centralized administrations, and boards of control of state college and university systems.

The statements that follow summarize particular issues of importance to student lobbies since 1970.

(1) Student lobbies are especially concerned about the cost of education to the student. Thus, financial aid issues, levels of tuition, the cost of housing and other student services, travel expenses, tax exemptions for student-consumed products and services, and financial independence from parents have been some of the issues of great concern.

(2) Student lobbies have been particularly involved in lobbying for measures that give students more institutionalized influence through formal channels: participation in governance, full citizenship, and collective bargaining. Students have spent an inordinate amount of time simply warding off attacks on the student mandatory activity fee—their financial base for operation.

At a more general level, student lobbies, operating as student funded and student controlled sources of influence, have sought to gain power by legitimizing their participation with other nonstudent, adult mechanisms of influence. These include student participation in governance at all levels from the local campus to the state level, student participation in collective bargaining, and student participation in voting and other rights that accompany the majority status

at the age of eighteen. Thus, we find lobbies interested in getting students named to boards of trustees at local and statewide levels and we find students lobbying state legislatures in efforts to amend current or proposed collective bargaining laws. Such amendments are designed to ensure student participation as third parties to negotiations, to prevent bargaining over matters crucial to students and student influence mechanisms, such as participation in ordinary governance channels, and finally to guarantee tuition rebates and other recourse in the event of faculty strikes (Semas, March 31, 1975, p. 1). We find student lobbies concerned with enacting reduced age-of-majority laws, eliminating local barriers to registration and voting in college communities, conducting voter registration drives, and monitoring student voter turnout and student voting patterns. All of these lobbying objectives have been designed to gain more influence indirectly through the use of the "establishment" political machinery open to other citizens and participants in the higher education enterprise.

(3) Student lobbies have also been interested in the quality of education. They have lobbied for smaller classes, student evaluation of teaching, and more recently have opposed the vagaries of retrenchment—dismissal or nonrenewal of young faculty members whom the students view to be "pro teaching." They have opposed cutbacks in popular programs, classroom equipment, and increased student/faculty ratios. They have also been vigilant in the area of affirmative action.

(4) Finally, lobbying has been used on a number of miscellaneous issues of direct concern to students. Most of these issues relate to student freedom "from things and people" and student freedom "to do things that others do": the use of alcoholic beverages on campuses, the maintenance of a safe environment for students (hitchhiking laws, pools, more lighting on the campus), elimination of reporting grades and medical records to parents and of "needs test" criteria for financial aid, and student access (The Buckley Amendment) to and control of student records.

In summary, student lobbies at the state level have been concerned most intensely with issues affecting the cost of their education and related services, the quality of their education, their rights and freedoms, and their channels of authority, power, and influence as students and as citizens.

*Student Institutions*

Another source of student influence developing in recent years

has been the growth of student-owned, student-staffed, and student-operated institutions such as the Public Interest Research Groups (PIRG's), student economic cooperatives, and other cooperative educational and cultural institutions designed to serve a student clientele. Several years ago Max Wise (1973, pp. 27-40) analyzed this trend and predicted its accelerated growth in the future, calling it "the student corporation." He stated:

> The rapid development of student-run services and student corporations which operate and manage bookstores, travel bureaus, laundry pick-up and delivery services, newspapers, and residential facilities . . . food stores, placement agencies, and clothing stores, has gone all but unnoticed to those who try to identify major trends in American higher education. Yet it may well be that the next decade will be marked not only by further extension of these student-run services on campuses, but by consolidation of these services with functions now associated with student government (Wise 1973, p. 27).

While there are few comprehensive surveys to document this trend, piecemeal evidence would indicate that Wise was correct. To his list we might add legal services, psychological services, entertainment booking services, student insurance services, credit unions, day-care centers, PIRG groups, free universities, and many others. As the earlier example of services sponsored by the Student Association of the State University of New York indicates, student governments have moved toward sponsoring, coordinating, or arranging many of these services.

Students derive influence through such cooperative institutional activities in several ways. First, students who are the consumers of such goods and services are provided with less expensive, more accessible and more appropriate products tailored to student needs and interests. They do not have to settle for shoddy goods and services from local merchants or poor representation by local lawyers in landlord/tenant cases, for example.

Secondly students may be emancipated from college administrative control (e.g., with independent newspapers and cooperative residential arrangements) and from external authority and control by the state or by local interest groups (e.g., with the PIRG groups).

Third, students who actively participate in the organization and operation of these student institutions have added a potentially powerful dimension to their own education. Perhaps the best published description of educative possibilities was written by Michael Rossman (1974, p. 30-35). Rossman calls the complex of student service and mercantile activities surrounding a university campus

"new town." He feels that new town may come to compete with "old gown" by providing students the opportunity to ". . . learn through first-hand and collective experience what it means to be an active shaper of society, a true citizen rather than a subject" (p. 34).

Finally, students may become more influential by virtue of providing "institutional models" of what might be replicated in some establishment circles—if only to compete with the vast youth (student and nonstudent) and consumer oriented markets. To some extent free universities have served this modeling function. Credit is now widely given for courses that several years ago could only be found in free universities run by students and other volunteers.

Examples of student cooperative institutions are not readily documented in either the periodical literature or the fugitive literature. As early as 1971, Hilary (1971) noted that the number and scope of student cooperatives had greatly expanded in college towns. At that time the North American Student Cooperative Organization had 314 member co-ops in 32 states and six Canadian provinces. Included, for example, was North Country Foods of St. Paul, Minnesota. In less than one year, North County was grossing $1,500 per day by selling mainly organic foods at wholesale prices plus 10 percent to cover costs. Milk sales alone were paying for the rent. This co-op deals directly with farmers and pays its six "coordinators" a "peoples wage" of $100 per month.

One of the oldest and largest student-owned businesses, Students of Berkeley, Inc., began in 1969 as a record store. It has since sprouted into a retail conglomerate that includes a clothing store, an arts and crafts store, a music supply store, a stereo equipment outlet, and a bicycle shop. The profits made by Students of Berkeley, Inc., are used for further expansion into new areas and to fund other local community, cooperative services such as a day-care center and the Berkeley Free Clinic (Hilary 1971; Sievert and Weidlein 1972).

Student-run housing cooperatives are flourishing in many college towns. At the University of Wisconsin, Madison, a full-time "coordinator" of housing co-ops has been hired. The independent co-ops are owned or leased by students. They are also managed and staffed by students, who established the rules and routines. At Wisconsin the co-ops undercut university dorms about $270 to $360 per year. These savings are accomplished by utilizing co-op members to purchase and cook meals and do janitorial services, and by eliminating supervisory personnel (Chase 1972). Some colleges

have been able to make fuller use of excess dormitory facilities by leasing them to groups as cooperative living arrangements (Bukotal 1974).

Legal services, medical advisory services, and free schools and universities are also popular in the complex of the "neighborhood corporation" in college towns. At Berkeley, Duke, Minnesota, and Wisconsin such services were among the first to be started (Sievert and Weidlein 1972). And, contrary to popular opinion, free universities are not dead. They continue to fill certain intellectual and emotional needs unavailable or too expensive as regular college-credit offerings (Lichtman 1972).

With limited evidence available on student cooperative institutions delivering goods and services, the following statements of trends are as much hypotheses as they are generalizations. They await more complete empirical validation:

(1) The scope, number, and budget of student cooperatives appears to be continually growing. They have become an important and influential economic force doing millions of dollars worth of business annually.

(2) Co-ops selling retail goods are generally self-sustaining, covering costs through modest earnings. They are nonprofit organizations and are patronized both by students and by other persons in the local community. These patrons enjoy lower prices for the products they purchase.

(3) Cooperative services appear to have a more complicated basis of financal support. Some are funded on a customer fee-for-service basis; some are funded by earnings from the more profitable "goods" cooperative sector; some are funded by donations; some are funded by student contributions ranging from direct and voluntary contributions to the more routine and mandatory student activities fees.

(4) Where student activities fees are used, the range and nature of the services may be more carefully supervised or circumscribed by university officials and other officials of the state or local community. Legal services are a case in point. Fully autonomous attorneys hired by groups of students may be free to accept cases against the university, the state, and local merchants. Attorneys hired with a closer relationship to the local college (for example, funded by a portion of each student's activity fee as collected by the university) may be precluded from handling (or at least litigating) cases brought by students against the college itself or from handling cases such as automobile accidents, wills, home closings, or other "bread-and-

butter" cases likely to shunt business away from local attorneys in town.

(5) Cooperatives provide opportunities for students to supplement their formal education through practical, cooperative, nonviolent, and useful activities of the sort highly recommended by the most recent and widely debated Coleman Report, *Youth: Transition to Adulthood*. While professionals are often hired by students to provide special expertise, legitimacy, and leadership, co-ops are still staffed predominantly by students who work as volunteers, interns or apprentices with a small salary, or as full partners. Opportunities for "field experiences" that carry academic credit exist with many cooperatives and appear to be a growing trend, paralleling the wider move to grant credit for nontraditional study.

The remainder of this section will consider a "student institution" to which all of the generalizations above seem to apply: the Public Interest Research Groups (PIRG's), which were inspired and founded in 1970 by consumer advocate Ralph Nader. These groups are organized near local college campuses as research and action groups that operate in the public interest. The analysis here is based on reports by Weidlein (1973), Anderson (1974), Senia (1974), Nader and Ross (1972), an article in *Chemical and Engineering News* entitled "Student Interest in Advocacy Groups Grows" (1972), and personal communication with the Citizen Action Group in Washington, D.C.

The Citizen Action Group is one of a number of affiliated agencies organized by Ralph Nader. Among other things, it provides organizational advice for getting local PIRG groups underway, monitors PIRG group activity, holds conferences with representatives of local PIRG groups, and occasionally publishes a sheet called *PIRG News*. Once a PIRG group is founded, it operates autonomously under local control with local funding, uses local staff, and deals with local issues (although these local issues may have national significance).

PIRG groups have been founded by student petitions (a majority of the student body) requesting a $3 increase in each student's activity fee to be earmarked for funding a local PIRG. Fees are collected at registration under a formal contract with local PIRG groups. Students not wishing to participate can receive a prompt refund of their fee. Some institutions simply provide a place for students to indicate whether they wish to provide the fee at the time of registration. Most colleges find that no more than 5 percent of their students ask for refunds.

As of 1973, these research groups were operating in 15 states at

some 50 colleges and universities with some 350,000 students contributing about $1 million. They are nonprofit, tax-exempt organizations controlled by student trustees and staffed by professionals (lawyers, scientists, etc.) and students. By 1973, the following states had PIRG groups: Arizona, Connecticut, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Oregon, Texas and Vermont. More recent figures indicate that 138 campuses (counting multicampus units of large state systems) in 18 states, which represent over 400,000 fee-paying students, are now supporting PIRG groups (Senia 1974, p. 29). Considering that there are at least 9 million regular, degree-credit students enrolled on traditional campuses around the country, the *potential* for a $20- to $30-million student public interest research effort is noteworthy.

Unlike the student lobbying groups discussed earlier, PIRG groups do not limit their attention to issues directly affecting students as students. They are more broadly concerned with issues such as consumer protection, resource planning, occupational safety, environmental protection, health care, racial and sex discrimination, public policy decisions, and matters of individual rights. A celebratory article by Jack Anderson (1974) describes many specific projects undertaken and presents evidence of their success in terms of social or political action.

The first two PIRG's were formed at the University of Oregon (OSPIRG) and at the University of Minnesota (MPIRG) during the 1970-71 academic year. The University of Minnesota began collecting a special fee of $3 a year for the operation of MPIRG after some 24,000 student signatures were presented on a petition. One of the largest groups, MPIRG has 10 to 13 full-time persons supported by a budget of $175,000 from students at 19 campuses in the state (Weidlein 1973). Among the research and action projects undertaken at MPIRG are a study of the Hennepin County jail and the Minneapolis Workhouse, a report on fraudulent hearing-aid sales practices, an investigation of school-bus safety, an inquiry into the health hazards of asbestos, action to prevent the cutting of timber in Superior National Forest, and a suit charging several companies with violations of Minnesota air and water standards.

Not surprisingly, these types of projects quickly become sore points with vested interest groups and ultimately are recycled in the form of political pressure to prevent the university from collecting fees for such projects (Logue 1975, p. 1, 8). MPIRG has had its fee-collecting system under constant attack by members of the state government. So,

too, has the New York Public Interest Research Group (NYPIRG). NYPIRG was founded chiefly by the larger private institutions in New York. It has since expanded to include the SUNY system and has 11 full-time employees and a budget near $160,000 per year. Now that a number of large SUNY campuses wish to join the NYPIRG effort, questions have arisen about the legality of SUNY collecting student fees either the way other states have done or by lump sum allocation by student government associations (such as SASU). NYPIRG spokesmen argue that SUNY supports the National Student Lobby, the National Student Association, and SASU (including the student lobbying efforts). To deny funds to NYPIRG would, they say, be to deny equal protection under the 14th Amendment. SUNY officials counter that these other organizations are funded by student activity fees by a "gentlemen's agreement" for narrowly defined purposes directly in the students' interests. Attempts by NYPIRG to force the issue might result in the collapse of the entire mandatory student fee structure upon which so many of the other sources of student influence rest (Senia 1974, p. 33).

Elsewhere, despite the fact that students at the University of Texas and the University of Houston obtained a majority of student signatures on petitions, the regents of these universities declined to collect fees to support local PIRG groups there. One report flatly stated, "We do not fund anything that we don't control" (Weidlein 1973, p. 4). At other universities, such as the Pennsylvania State University and the University of Rhode Island, PIRG groups are being held up over disagreements with the mandatory fee-collection system. Students generally uphold such a system but boards of control prefer either a positive or negative "check-off" system. Students argue that a "check-off" system would greatly reduce revenues for PIRG (Citizen Action Group 1975).

In conclusion, it would seem that the broader social and consumer mandate of the PIRG groups, while strongly supported by the students, results in an extremely vulnerable and tenuous relationship to the state. It may be that if students wish to further institutionalize public interest advocacy, it will have to be done as an unambiguously private matter. The line between "students as students" and "students as citizens" is a fine one. With the acquisition of the 18-year-old vote and earlier onset of the age of majority, students seem to be moving toward full citizen status. Our country has always been reluctant to give its citizens the power of advocacy and social reform that uses the direct machinery and funding channels of the state itself. Colleges and universities also must tread softly in this realm

to sustain their funding base, even though they have the tradition of academic freedom to refer to. Apparently public funds must be appropriately laundered (for example, through foundations supported by private money as tax write-offs) before they may support organized and broadly directed social reform. If students are to be citizens, they may have to follow rules of this sort when they want to go beyond issues of direct and immediate concern to their welfare as students, notwithstanding the educational value and constructive alternative to "old-style" protest that PIRG's apparently provide.

## Student Participation in Established Political Structures and Processes

The last section described some of the emerging sources of student influence derived from students operating as a separate force—student protest, student lobbying, and student institutions. This section describes and discusses ways in which students have sought influence by participating in established, nonstudent processes. These nonstudent processes include shared participation in campus governance, student participation in collective bargaining between faculty unions and administrators, and student extrainstitutional participation as newly enfranchised voters and adults at the age of 18. The difference in these two general ways of deriving influence is that in the first instance students have acted unilaterally to organize a new student force; in the second case students have sought to become a part of already existing political processes, to become full voting citizens and full adults—to be treated like everyone else.

*Student Participation in Campus Governance*

In part as the result of student activist demands, student participation in the existing governance structures of colleges and universities began in the 1960's. Students pressed for and began to be represented on faculty senates, standing and ad hoc committees, and even boards of trustees. A substantial number of colleges developed unicameral models of campus governance, integrating students into the regular policy-making channels (Hodgkinson 1971 pp. 47-48). Sometimes students served as full voting members of committees, councils and boards (though rarely with a controlling representation) and in other instances they served only in an advisory role. As might be expected students were better represented on committees dealing directly with student life and interests and were least represented on committees dealing with faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions (McGrath 1970, pp. 106-107).

Increasing numbers of colleges are appointing students or young alumni to their boards of trustees. In 1972, according to the American Council on Education, 14 percent of America's colleges had students on their governing boards; 58 percent of these did not allow students to vote (*CHE*, November 18, 1972, p. 1). More recently students have been pressing to participate on statewide boards of control, since



ED 35

state systems have resulted in more centralized decision making (*CHE*, March 4, 1974, p. 6).

McHugh (1971, p. 180) notes that almost any task force established by a college today has some student representation on it. Ad hoc efforts such as the site selection for new buildings, the selection of administrative staff, programs for the disadvantaged, relationships with the surrounding community, parking problems, and an endless variety of other matters usually include students.

It seems clear that practically every member of the academic community cooperated in finding ways to best include the interests of students in campus decision-making processes. Faculty, administrators, and prestigious national commissions went on record as supporting the idea that student interests should be formalized in a mutually acceptable governance plan (The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, April 1973, pp. 61-72). Differences existed only as to the particular topics or problems commanding student input (student discipline, faculty promotion) and the nature of the participation (ranging from full student control and voting power on committees to formal or informal consultation).

The question of whether students have been effective as participants in campus governance is not easy to answer. In fact, students at many institutions are dissatisfied with the influence they feel they have. Students at Michigan, Stanford, Wisconsin, and Duke, for example, are seeking a still greater voice in the affairs of their universities (Sievert and Weidlein 1972, p. 5). Indeed, many of the activities by the various student lobby groups have been directed toward trying to gain a more institutionalized grasp on the ever-shifting reins of college governance. Nevertheless, students have made progress in the last 15 years and they do not want to lose it all to the latest threat to their power—collective bargaining.

*Collective Bargaining and College Students*

Student participation in formal governance structures was born at a time when achieving consensus and unity on the campus was threatened by the fragmenting forces of confrontation politics. It was also a time when faculty power was at its zenith. Faculty members were not threatened by the bread-and-butter issues that would later come with enrollment stabilization, retrenchment, and financial strain. Since the advent of collective bargaining on many campuses, it is unclear whether the shared participation concept of governance can remain viable. Students, in particular, have been forced to examine

the impact bargaining will have on them and on their recently gained roles in joint decision making (Semas, April 30, 1973, p. 4).

There is little doubt that many of the issues now under consideration in collective negotiations between faculty and administration have a direct effect on students as well. Faculty contract demands have involved workload, teaching assignments, seniority rights, class size, contact hours, faculty rank ratios, curriculum, faculty-student ratios, prior consultation on educational policy, and budget matters (McHugh 1971, p. 179). Negotiations have also included governance, academic freedom, facilities, educational programs, and student services (Coe 1973, p. 11; Shark 1973, p. 9).

Approximately 385 campuses across the United States now have bargaining agents representing the faculty, most of whom are in the public sector. Many other campuses have been considering collective bargaining as new state enabling laws become imminent. The outlook seems to be further growth in collective negotiations, which will affect a greater number of college students both directly and indirectly (Mortimer 1975, pp. 1-2). Although most students have indicated little interest in participating in faculty-administration negotiations (Shark 1975, p. 263), they do share three basic concerns:

(1) Students fear that they will lose their expanded role in campus governance through faculty members and/or administrators bargaining their participation away.

(2) Students are concerned that salaries and benefits won by faculty members will ultimately be paid for by higher tuitions or education of lesser quality.

(3) Students are concerned that faculty strikes will interrupt their education, cause undue delay or otherwise inconvenience them.

How real are these fears and concerns some student leaders have of bipartite collective negotiations? The National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education examined 145 academic bargaining contracts. Only 28 percent (40) of these contained references to student prerogatives. The 40 contracts mention evaluation of faculty, student senates, or student governance activities. Student input regarding admissions, academic standards, educational research and/or the institutional calendar was mentioned in 15 of the contracts. Only eight contracts made provisions for committees on which students would have voting rights. Alan R. Shark, in reporting the results of this study, further states:

> . . . of the forty contracts that contained references to student rights six mention students more than twice, six mention them twice, and the remaining 28 but once. It is significant to note that no student represen-

> tative was present at the bargaining table during negotiations for the 145 contracts analyzed in this study, including the 40 contracts which contained references to student rights (Shark, July 1975, p. 2).

It is not reported how these 145 contracts were chosen, but the clear intimation is that student concerns are being left out of the bargained contracts. In addition, unions have tried during collective negotiations to specifically proscribe student rights. During collective bargaining at the City University of New York, agreement was reached in July 1973 only after, among other items, the union dropped its demand for a clause limiting the right of students to vote on faculty promotion and tenure committees, pending a ruling by the State Public Employee Relations Board on whether such a clause was a legitimate issue for negotiation (*CHE*, July 30, 1973, p. 4).

The relationship between collective bargaining and the more traditional faculty senate is important because many senates now include student participation. Some student-faculty senates are losing their influence or being phased out altogether. For example, at Saginaw Valley College in Michigan the student-faculty legislature was dissolved by the administration when the faculty elected a bargaining agent (Coe 1973, pp. 11-12). Mortimer (1975, pp. 9-16) presents an excellent discussion of the uneasy relationship between unions and the senate. Mortimer reports that in Pennsylvania five or six institutions have dissolved their senates, but only one of these was a four-year college (Mortimer 1975, pp. 11-12). In a study of collective bargaining since 1969, Begin comments:

> To date, none of the four-year institutions which have been bargaining have reported that faculty senates have ceased to operate, including those institutions which have been organized the longest, for example, St. Johns University, Central Michigan University, City University of New York, State University of New York, Southeastern Massachusetts, the New Jersey State Colleges, and Rutgers University. In fact, at Central Michigan University and Rutgers University there is some feeling on the part of the administration that senates are participating more actively in policy deliberation than before the onset of collective bargaining (Begin 1974, p. 584).

Thus, it is not settled yet, at least in the four-year colleges, whether the campus governance structure and any student participation in it will be supplanted or rendered impotent by negotiated contracts.

In addition to the potential loss of their role in governance, students fear they will ultimately have to pay for any negotiated increases in salary, fringe benefits, and reduced teaching workloads won by the faculty. Some feel that payment might take the form of increased tuition and fees or a curtailment of student services, campus

facilities, innovative programs, course offerings, and an increase in class size (Shark, July 1975, p. 3). While such concerns may prove to be groundless, there is evidence that the potential cost increase is at least a live issue. For example, students at Oakland University in Michigan during the 1971 negotiations claimed that meeting the union demands would mean curtailment or elimination of financial aid, urban affairs programs, and special student services (Coe 1973, p. 11). During the 1972 negotiations at the City University of New York, a union spokesman charged that the administration's position reflected a mistaken belief that any "advantages" sought by the union would jeopardize open admissions programs (Jacobson 1972, p. 3).

Not only do students potentially suffer increased tuition and decreased services, but they also face the possibility of having their education totally interrupted by faculty strikes. At Oakland University, where the AAUP is the bargaining agent, faculty went on strike in September 1971 for 10 days. Although there were no picket lines, the administration closed the college and sent the students home (Pitts 1972, p. 19). Students were confronted with the hardship of making new living arrangements when residence halls were closed (Coe 1973, p. 12).

At Lake Michigan College, students suddenly found themselves with two sets of teachers when the faculty went on strike in the spring semester of 1973. The college's board dismissed the original faculty for striking in violation of a Michigan law, which prohibits strikes by public employees, and proceeded to replace them with a new faculty (Semas, May 14, 1973, p. 5). A court order then called for reinstatement of the original faculty, resulting in a disruptive situation when the two faculties confronted each other in the classroom. Other strikes in the fall of 1973 inconvenienced students or interrupted classes at Columbia University, Wayne County Community College in Detroit, and Westmoreland Community College in Pennsylvania (Semas, Sept. 24, 1973, p. 3).

The course of faculty strikes took an interesting turn in September 1972 when 90 percent of the faculty at the Community College of Philadelphia went on a 37-day strike that delayed the start of the fall term (Coe 1973, p. 12). After students unsuccessfully protested and held meetings with faculty, administration, and city officials in an attempt to end the strike, the students took their case to court to prevent the college from cancelling the semester (Ebert 1972, p. 3; *CHE*, September 25, 1972, p. 9). The Philadelphia College students charged that: (1) the State Community College Act did not authorize the trustees to close the college; (2) closing the college was equivalent

to expelling students without due process; and (3) terminating the semester or "disestablishing" a college required the approval of the state board of higher education. An agreement was reached shortly after the suit was filed (Coe 1973, p. 14).

That same semester the faculty of another community college in Pennsylvania, the Community College of Allegheny County in Pittsburgh, also went on strike. At Allegheny, two suits were filed by separate student groups in a local court. The first alleged that the college should not have permitted the strike on the grounds that it was illegal under the Pennsylvania Public Employee Relations Act. The second suit argued that the strike was causing irreparable damage to the students by threatening their welfare and denying them an education, as well as jeopardizing the aid students received under the GI bill, welfare, and social security. The faculty union and the college board were then ordered into court. However, agreement was reached and the strike was settled on the day the judge was to rule on the suit, thus making the case moot (Ebert 1972, p. 1). Both union leaders and college administrators attributed settlements of these two strikes to the pressure students exerted through the courts (Semas, April 30, 1973, p. 4).

To the extent that students have been placed in a defensive position with respect to the consequences of collective bargaining, it has been a threat to student influence. At the same time, there is evidence that students have participated or been involved in collective bargaining in an increasingly active way. The ways in which students have been or could be involved in collective bargaining constitute a newly emerging source of student influence.

Student involvement in collective bargaining has been conceptualized in a variety of ways. Aussieker (1975), Bucklew (July 1973; Fall 1973), and Shark (July 1975) are highly recommended reading for further information and elaboration. All of these authors have been intimately involved in some aspect of collective bargaining.

Students have increasingly taken an active stance through the lobbying activities mentioned earlier in this study. This is a form of what Aussieker (1975, p. 2) calls "end-run bargaining." Here, students appeal to officials and agencies other than the bargaining parties, in some cases the state legislature.

The Student Lobby in Montana was successful in April 1975 in getting a bill passed that made specific provision for students to participate in the bargaining process. This bill was the first in the nation to give statutory recognition to the right of students to such participation (*CHE*, April 7, 1975, p. 4). The Montana law defines the

Board of Regents as the public employer and provides that a student will be a member of the Regents negotiating team. The law states:

> . . . the student government at an institution of higher education may designate an agent or representative to meet and confer with the Board of Regents and the faculty bargaining agent prior to negotiations with the professional negotiations and participate in caucuses as part of the public employer's bargaining team, and to meet and confer with the Board of Regents regarding the terms of agreement prior to the execution of a written contract between the Regents and the professional educational employees (Shark, July 1975, p. 4).

The Montana Student Lobby also sought legislation guaranteeing students a tuition rebate in case of a faculty strike. That bill was defeated (*CHE*, April 7, 1975, p. 4).

In Oregon, the legislature adopted a collective bargaining bill in 1973, but a number of amendments have been proposed. Among them are student proposals to permit participation in negotiations and to permit tuition rebates to students in case of strikes (Semas, March 31, 1975, p. 8). In June 1975, students were granted independent third-party status at the bargaining table through a bill which passed the Oregon legislature by a wide majority (Shark, July 1975, p. 4).

In Maine, California, and Wisconsin, student lobbies are making progress with their respective state legislatures in gaining some form of participation in collective negotiations, including observer status, "meet and confer" provisions, and the right to submit "impact reports" on how bargaining would affect vital student interests (Semas, March 31, 1975, p. 8; Shark, July 1975, pp. 4,5).

Lobbying is a way of seeking a statutory mandate for student participation in the bargaining process. Neil Bucklew has suggested three models that provide a useful way of conceptualizing these various forms of involvement: indirect representation, observer/participant, and full participant (Bucklew, Fall 1973, p. 304).

The indirect representation model is based on the assumption that the two parties directly involved in the negotiations (faculty union and university administration) will be able to represent adequately student concerns without involving students in the actual negotiations. There are several ways in which such representation can be accomplished. One method would be to assign a bargaining agent, such as a student affairs officer, the special task of evaluating the effect of bargaining issues on students and student life (Bucklew, Fall 1973, p. 304). Another method would use students on negotiation resource subcommittees. Such involvement could be part of the preparation



611

process or could occur during the course of fact-finding or arbitration proceedings. In any event, this type of student involvement would take place away from the bargaining table. Another form of indirect representation of student interests would be on committees established by the contract itself. Here students would participate during the postnegotiation or contract implementing stage (McHugh 1971, p. 184).

In Bucklew's second model for student representation in collective bargaining (observer/participant), students would be involved in the actual negotiations but would be silent observers or have only limited participation. In such a scheme, students might discuss only those matters directly affecting them or possibly speak only to answer questions; or students might participate fully in discussions but have no other bargaining rights; or students might be included as members of one or both bargaining teams. This last option would, of course, raise the issue of whether the student members were advocates of the students or of one of the parties to negotiation (Bucklew, Fall 1973, p. 304).

The third model would have a student team included as a third party to the negotiations, thus making the collective bargaining arrangement a tripartite one. According to Bucklew:

> The student team could have the power to present counter-proposals but not to initiate original demands, or it could be granted approval/veto power over any bargaining agreement directly affecting students. As another option, the team could be granted full bargaining team rights including the power to present, demand, and ratify any final contract agreement.
>
> The legal status of tripartite negotiations is unclear. Labor relations statutes are written to describe a bipartite decisionmaking system. A third party would have no legal involvement, but whether such a party could be involved to an extent that would limit the power of the original two parties to reach agreement becomes an unanswered legal question (Bucklew, Fall 1973, p. 304).

In actual practice, it appears that student involvement in collective bargaining in any given case does not fit cleanly into one of these three categories. Students have participated as "observers" in several colleges including Fitchburg State College (Massachusetts), Salem State College (Massachusetts), the University of Bridgeport (Connecticut), the University of Cincinnati, Southern Oregon College, Long Island University, Rhode Island College, and Bloomfield College (New Jersey) (Shark, July 1975, p. 6). In most cases student observers have been limited in the extent to which they could present the student perspective, have access to all information, introduce proposals, or caucus with either party (Shark, July 1975, p. 6).

Students at Fitchburg State, North Adams State, and Salem State Colleges in Massachusetts have had a considerable influence in collective negotiations. These students may almost be considered an independent third party with the right to participate in all negotiations. However, they cannot prevent the other two parties from reaching an agreement (*CHE*, January 15, 1973, p. 1; Semas, October 29, 1973, p. 1; Semas, April 1, 1974, p. 3).

At least in the short run, the relatively powerful position of students in the Massachusetts state colleges may be in jeopardy for at least two reasons. Up to July 1974, state colleges in Massachusetts could not negotiate matters involving faculty salaries and fringe benefits and, therefore, concentrated on issues of governance that were considered to be more directly a student concern. Secondly, students at Fitchburg State College were originally asked to be a part of negotiations by the faculty bargaining team. To the chagrin of the faculty, students proceeded to declare themselves as independent and, in practice, often sided with the administration on key issues. The following year (1974-75) students were not invited to take part in negotiations by either side.

At Salem State College the faculty voted 148 to 66 to reject a contract that included extensive student participation in governance, including a student vote on the hiring, promotion, and tenure of faculty members. Earlier student participation in bargaining was reportedly an issue in the lopsided vote (Semas, April 1, 1974, p. 3).

In another case, the student body president of Ferris State College in Michigan served as a full member of the administration team in contract negotiations with the college's faculty. The governing board initiated the student participation, which involved caucusing, helping to draft counter-proposals, speaking during the bargaining sessions, and signing the contract (Semas, December 10, 1973, p. 12). This is an example of what Aussieker would call "coalition bargaining"—the formation of rather formalized coalitions between faculty or administration and students (Aussieker 1975, p. 8). This is the kind of model for which the new Montana law has made provisions.

In other instances students have participated in the prenegotiation or postnegotiation stages of collective bargaining. For example, at Southern Massachusetts University, the faculty federation, prior to formal negotiations, informally consulted and negotiated a package of students' rights and responsibilities in governance. The faculty agreed to present this package to the board of trustees at the bargaining table, but with no guarantee of its acceptance. The board of



543

trustees did endorse the proposed student participation in the specific areas of curriculum development and student evaluation of teaching effectiveness (Orze 1974, p. 11).

At Boston State and Worcester State in Massachusetts, contract provisions relating to student governance were subject to postnegotiation ratification by vote of the student bodies (Semas, April 30, 1973, p. 4).

What is the extent of student involvement in collective bargaining of the kinds illustrated above? Both Aussieker (1975, pp. 17-18) and Shark (July 1975, p. 7) agree that student involvement in negotiations has not been extensive. There have been about thirty incidents of the more formal types of student involvement as of the fall of 1974. According to a survey of 48 unionized bargaining relationships on 4-year campuses, students were involved in only 14 of these. Of these 48 bargaining relationships, students were involved in 13 of 26 in the public sector and only one of 22 in the private sector (Aussieker 1975, p. 17, 18).

What, then, can be said of the effectiveness of collective bargaining as an emerging source of student influence? Several tentative conclusions emerge from the foregoing review of the literature.

First, students have been influential in fighting a rear-guard battle to prevent bargaining from nullifying earlier gains made in student participation in governance and to protect themselves from the vagaries of faculty strikes. They have done this most effectively through a combination of "old-style protest," legislative lobbying, and the use of the courts for injunctive relief.

While some students have participated effectively in the bargaining process, such participation is not widespread and, at this time, no one particular model has emerged that would fit students into the negotiation, prenegotiation or postnegotiation stages of collective bargaining in a satisfactory way. Indeed, Shark believes that ". . . given the lack of real success and the general apathy now found on college campuses, students' interest in carving a role in the bargaining process may very well decline" (Shark, July 1975, p. 7).

Nevertheless, in the current decade of declining enrollments and with the need, therefore, to attract and keep students, it would seem that students would have greater leverage and influence than ever before. One might reasonably expect students to use this leverage to insist on shaping their education in line with their own vital interests. On the other hand, the same set of circumstances—enrollment problems, potential program and faculty retrenchment—make it less likely that faculty unions or administrators will want

to concede power to the students when their own (faculty and administration) interests and survival are at stake. The net result of these dynamics of the student as educational consumer may simply add up to no particular gain or no particular loss in the current status of student influence.

Finally, it should be mentioned that Aussieker is pessimistic about the efforts of students, faculty, and administrators to influence legislation and thus structure student involvement in bargaining. He feels that the result ". . . will leave students with an already existing base or a less supportive one for different types of involvement" (Aussieker 1975, p. 20). However, it does appear that student lobbies are developing momentum in their quest to gain statutory rights to participate in collective bargaining. While these statutes might inordinately proscribe student involvement, they might also institutionalize and legitimate student involvement resulting in a more continuous effort. It will then be possible to study, as Shark puts it, ". . . the actual impact of student input on negotiations in states where student participation is guaranteed by law" (Shark, July 1975, p. 7).

It appears too early to judge whether the kind of participation found to date or the kind expected in the future will result in real and growing sources of student influence. The reader may wish to keep apprised of the development through several agencies now established to study important questions that bear upon future student influence. One such agency, sponsored by the University Student Senate of the City University of New York and funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, is the Research Project on Students and Collective Bargaining in Washington, D. C. Another project, the Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, also in Washington, was established by a number of associations of colleges and universities and is funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The purpose, in part, is to provide a clearinghouse for information pertinent to all aspects of academic collective bargaining, including the role of the student in such bargaining.

*Students as Citizens and Adults*

On June 30, 1971, the 26th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States was ratified by the states extending the voting franchise to youth of 18 years and older. Shortly thereafter, some 44 states lowered the legal age of majority in one or more respects, with the age ranging as low as 18 or 19 for some purposes (Hanson

1975, p. 5). These new legal developments applied to all youth of these ages, including most college students heretofore considered "minors." The question is what influence or potential influence have students had or might students expect to derive from this and what are the existing barriers to this influence?

The immediate effect of the 18-year-old vote was to enfranchise 11 million voters for the fall 1972 elections. For the first time, most college students had the right to vote subject only to the constraints of state residency laws. This was a direct source of student influence of potentially great effectiveness as evidenced by the number of analyses of the impact of the youth vote in general and the student vote in particular (McNett 1972; Maquire 1972; Lipset 1972).

To realize the potential influence of voting, students would have to register and then actually vote. Both of these processes have been difficult for students to do. In the case of presidential elections, state residency requirements do not apply. The problem becomes one of getting students to register. Voter registration drives at local and national levels were conducted with heavy participation from students. A national organization called Student Vote became active on 305 campuses by the fall of 1972. A small Washington staff coordinated the efforts of field workers in 13 regions of the United States. These field workers pursued educational campaigns and voter registration with local student and civic groups. The national office provided expertise, literature, educational material and small grants. As of June 1, 1972, 500,000 students were registered as a result of the efforts of Student Vote (McNett 1972, p. 10).

There are also barriers to registration imposed by state and local statutes in the form of residency requirements of one year or more as part of the voter qualifications for state and local elections. This was a severe restriction on those college students who were not residents of the local community or state. In addition, the so-called "gain-or-loss" statutes generally prevent students from ever acquiring a voting residence in a college community as long as they are students. These laws apply only to students who, prior to matriculation, were not residents of a local community or a particular state. Students cannot "gain" voting privileges in communities where they have moved to attend college. At the same time, they do not "lose" voting privileges in the communities they came from (Bornstein 1972, pp. 356-365; Guido 1972, pp. 32-58).

Both of these restrictions have come under severe judicial attack and scrutiny by the courts, especially since the 26th Amendment was ratified. The Supreme Court of the United States, in a landmark

decision (Blumstein v. Ellington, 92 S. Ct. 995 [1972]), struck down Tennessee's one-year requirement on the grounds that it interfered with the right to interstate travel and did not serve a compelling state interest. The court did not state flatly what residency length might be acceptable, but suggested that 30 days would be reasonable. Bornstein (1972, p. 365) expects this decision to remove the durational residency roadblocks to student voting in the future.

Students are vulnerable to attack under the due process and equal protection clauses of the 14th Amendment because the gain-or-loss statutes often use more exacting criteria for college students than for other immigrants to communities and states. In a penetrating but somewhat outdated review of these residency laws, Bornstein concludes:

> . . . the status of these provisions is unsettled at present, although it seems that the conflict can and should be resolved in favor of the student on Equal Protection grounds. That is to say, a balancing of the competing interests should lead to the conclusion that giving the student a voice in his government is more important than preventing the "harm" which the states expect to suffer through giving the franchise to large blocks of student voters (Bornstein 1972, p. 369).

Students have not hesitated to use the courts to gain more favorable treatment as they seek to exercise the power of voting in local elections. For instance, a federal district judge in Texas has struck down a provision that college students must intend to live in their college town before they can vote. A federal court in Missouri has issued a restraining order preventing county clerks from demanding more evidence of voter qualifications from students than are demanded of other citizens (*CHE*, Oct. 16, 1972, p. 4). In a suit brought by nine students at Mississippi State University, a federal district judge has ordered local election officials to apply the same residency requirements to college students as are applied to other potential voters (*CHE*, Nov. 6, 1972, p. 4). The New Jersey Supreme Court abolished a state law that required students to vote in the community of their parents' home (McNett 1972, p. 10). On the other hand, a New York court, adopting a strict interpretation of the students' domicile, required students to vote in towns where their parents live (*CHE*, September 25, 1972, p. 2).

As mentioned earlier, students have also sought statutory relief through legislative lobbying from indirect or direct attempts to make it impossible or inconvenient for them to vote in college communities through calendar changes (usually occurring in primary elections). In these efforts they have been successful.

All of these efforts represent attempts by students to realize their potential as voting citizens at all levels of government where their interests are at stake. Like other citizens students want to vote for candidates who will be sympathetic to their interests and concerns. In the college communities where they attend classes, students are vitally affected by policies and ordinances related to crime and police protection, transportation, work settings, landlord/tenant relationships, personal property tax policies, fees and licenses, and the practice of local merchants. At the state level, students are affected by sales taxes, liquor laws, drug laws, abortion and morals regulations, admissions quotas, tuition policy, and appropriations for financial aid and other student services. At the federal level, students are vitally interested in appropriations for large-scale financial aid programs, minimum wage laws, airline fare regulations, and federal guidelines on racial and sex discrimination in colleges and universities.

Like other emerging sources of influence outlined in this study, the effectiveness or strength of student influence through voting is difficult to assess. In general, there is evidence that the turnout of student voters has been disappointing (Thurber 1973, pp. 242-256). There is also some evidence that college students who do vote tend to follow a pattern set by college educated adults and tend to accept the traditional party labels and identity of their parents (Shaw 1974, pp. 65-79). At the same time, in some local elections, college students seem to have made a difference in election outcomes. For example, after a major drive to register students at the University of Colorado at Boulder in 1971, every student-supported candidate for city council was eletced. Four incumbents were defeated (McNett 1972, p. 10).

Each year the University of California Student Lobby does an analysis of student voting patterns as part of its effort to gain influence through the established political process. Its recent study of the June 1974 primary elections in California makes two pertinent points. First, the student voter turnout rate was about the same as the statewide average when allowance was made for campuses closed for the summer, or where students were taking final exams, and when the transient nature of the student body was taken into account. Secondly, the study seems to demonstrate that Republican Congressman Paul McCloskey's successful primary reelection bid was made possible by a margin of victory provided by college student voters (many crossed over to register Republican in order to vote for McCloskey) (Woodruff and Fuller 1974, p. 12).

Finally, the symbolic value of the 18-year-old student vote should

not be overlooked. It is hard to document but it seems likely that students have gained more status and legitimacy in their other political pursuits (such as lobbying or bargaining) partly because they are now enfranchised citizens.

Another issue, only tangentially related to the student as citizen, has an impact upon student sources of influence. This is the issue of student residency for tuition purposes and the high tuition differentials for out-of-state students. Restrictive admissions policies and tuition policies have the effect of closing off options for college students. Students lose several degrees of freedom when they cannot afford or are not permitted to leave their local community or state for a college education. They lose the freedom to travel across state lines and to choose their associates. They are, in effect, captive audiences. In such a situation, students lose the leverage they might otherwise have in attempting to influence local campus policy that relates to their vital interests.

Indeed, migration studies of college students (Fenske et al., 1974) show that student attendance at local colleges is on the increase and student involvement in interstate migration is on the decline. This decline is due partially to the spread of community colleges in many states. But it is also due to increased transportation costs, restrictive out-of-state admissions policies, and skyrocketing out-of-state tuition differentials.

At this time the constitutionality of tuition differentials appears to have been firmly established. Also the right of the states to require a one-year durational residency period, in addition to certain domiciliary requirements, seems to be legally established (Hanson 1975, pp. 19-23; Bornstein 1972, p. 356). However, since the Vlandis vs. Klein decision by the United States Supreme Court in 1973, students now have the possibility of making a case to overcome out-of-state status. A presumption of out-of-state status can now be rebutted and colleges must establish processes for hearing such appeals. These cases and other admissions barriers to gaining residency in the several states have been extensively and ably discussed by Bornstein (1972), Carbone (1973), Chronister and Martin (1975), and Hanson (1975).

Partly because of the Vlandis vs. Klein decision, the need to increase student enrollment, and newer consortium arrangements, there is some hope that student interstate migration might begin to increase (Carbone, Fall 1973; Shulman 1974). Wisconsin and Minnesota, for example, have developed an exchange program whereby residents of either state can attend public colleges in the neighboring state at resident student rates. If one state assumes a greater share of the ex-

change, the other state will reimburse from the state treasury (Carbone, Fall 1973, p. 270).

The point is that policies and practices that decrease the options for students also decrease the potential influence that students might wield. The issue of residency for tuition purposes represents a point at which the "student as full citizen" conflicts with what has been established as a "compelling state interest." For students who attend local colleges, residency status for the purpose of voting in local elections is not a problem. It may be that the influence gained by having the opportunity to move out of one's community is, in part, cancelled by the problem of establishing a voting residence in the new college town. At the same time, the influence lost by those who do not have the opportunity to leave their home community or state may be cancelled by the influence gained due to clear rights to vote in local elections.

On balance, it seems that students have gained an important source of influence with the enactment of the 26th Amendment. At the same time, significant barriers remain and may always remain to full citizenship status for college students.

Like the voting franchise, the reduction in age of majority to 18 has also served to enhance the status of college students as adults. What are the implications of this new adult status for student influence? Have students been given more freedom to choose what they want to do and how they wish to live? Or are students still constrained by parents or college officials who stand in loco parentis? This section draws heavily on *The Lowered Age of Majority: Its Impact on Higher Education* (Hanson 1975). The reader is urged to peruse this monograph, which is devoted almost exclusively to the legal ramifications of this topic.

One result of the concept of adulthood at 18 is to indirectly encourage the use of legal processes by students. Many colleges are gearing up through their student legal aid staffs in anticipation of even greater use of the courts as students seek to press charges or defend themselves against charges brought by other students or the institution. Room-and-board contracts, suits for property damage and disruption, suits against the college for failure to deliver the academic services promised and suits involving the use of student funds for activity fees or to support certain organizations are some of the areas in which litigation is expected to occur (Fields 1973, p. 3). Students, while potentially more free to use legal processes to exert influence, may also have to assume the responsibilities of acting as independent adult citizens. They may experience even less protection from the

consequences of their own actions by parents, by college authorities, and by the local state law enforcement officials.

Another potential effect is to free the student from many of the lingering ties to parents. Practices such as notifying parents of grades, health problems, or disciplinary actions may be carefully reexamined. For instance, at Ohio State University, parents will no longer be notified when a student receives an academic warning, is placed on probation, or is dismissed. This change was made pursuant to a new Ohio law lowering the age of majority to 18 (*CHE*, Feb. 11, 1974, p. 2).

Passage of the Educational Amendment of 1974, known as the "Buckley Amendment," appears to further protect the rights and privacy of college students. This amendment includes restrictions on access to student files by persons other than the student and requires written consent by the student for release of information. Subsection (d) of the amendment provides that:

> . . . for the purposes of this section, whenever a student has attained eighteen years of age or is attending an institution of post-secondary education, the permission or consent required of and the rights accorded to parents of the student shall thereafter only be required of and accorded to the student (quoted in Hanson 1975, p. 36).

Lowered age-of-majority laws appear to affect the freedom of the college student to enter into contractual relationships, such as dormitory contracts or promissory notes for loans, and to seek medical treatment without parental cosigning or consent. Despite the apparent legal mandate supplied by reduced age-of-majority laws in many states, Hanson (1975 pp. 33-37) found that in practice few institutions have adjusted their policies in response to these laws. He reports that "there seems to be no clear relationship between the legal age of majority and institutional policies regarding parental notification on grades, discipline or psychological problems" (Hanson 1975, p. 35). Hanson's conclusions are based on a relatively informal questionnaire and interview survey of deans of students at 100 randomly chosen colleges and universities. He reports an overall response rate of 72 percent. One problem with Hanson's survey is that it was cross-sectional rather than longitudinal in design. He appears simply to compare the policies and practices of colleges in states with lowered age of majority to colleges in states with a higher age of majority at a given point in time. With such a design it is not really possible to assess the impact or change from one point in time to another of majority laws upon campus policies and practices. Clearly, further empirical work needs to be done in this area.

Financially, too, students are seeking emancipation from parental control. The new age-of-majority laws have given students a basis for challenging the requirement that their family must contribute to the costs of a college education before they can qualify for financial aid. Financial aid officers find that larger percentages of students are now declaring themselves independent and self-supporting (Fields 1974, p. 3; Hanson 1975; p. 17). Hanson expects that the new age-of-majority laws will provide some impetus to challenging the constitutionality of the presumption that students are "dependent," based on certain questionable criteria used in many federal grant and loan programs (Hanson 1975, p. 17). It was reported that a study done by Boyd and Fenske in Illinois showed that parents' portion of student support has declined from 60 percent in 1967-68 to 39 percent in 1973-74 (Boyd and Fenske, June 1975). They attributed this trend to a student desire for financial emancipation and the growing availability of student financial aid funds from all levels of government (*CHE*, April 7, 1975, p. 6; *CHE*, November 18, 1974, p. 1).

The option to become financially independent from one's family is double-edged. Those who are "freed" will have the responsibility to seek funds through other channels. Institutional sources of aid may be severely strained and students may encounter other constraints. Nevertheless, the point here is that more students will have the power to decide for themselves how to finance their education. They may also be more free to make choices of particular colleges or particular programs of study, unencumbered by the threat of funding withdrawal by disapproving parents. This, indeed, is a source of student influence over things that matter to them.

A final area of concern is that of required residence hall living and related parietal rules. It appears that rules requiring particular categories of students or even all students to live in dormitories are increasingly under attack. After reviewing a number of landmark legal cases in this area, Hanson concludes:

> It appears that courts will not sanction regulations which are simply intended to 'fill the dorms,' because the result is to make one group of students bear a disproportionate burden of financial expense and restrictions in personal liberty to reside in accommodations to effect a benefit for all students, present and future. Second, the mere assertion of educational benefits, or that living requirements are motivated to give educational benefits, seems unlikely to be persuasive unless the institution can demonstrate such benefits. Finally, even if the institution can show evidence of education-related motivations in enacting such a requirement, the courts are likely to examine the actual operation of the regulations to determine if there is such an educational benefit (Hanson 1975, p. 31).

Again, Hanson (1975, p. 30) suggests that the lowered age of majority will likely influence future cases in the area of required dormitory living. Recently, six students at Stony Brook filed suit in federal court to overthrow regulations that require all freshmen under 21 to live on campus. They also challenged mandatory meal plans on the grounds that they were arbitrary and unconstitutional since 18-year-olds are considered adults under New York State laws (CHE, May 12, 1975, p. 2).

Finally, regarding rules related to living in residence halls, Hanson (1975, pp. 34-35) finds little relationship between majority laws and the restrictiveness of rules about visitation by members of the opposite sex, curfews and possession of alcoholic beverages. In general, over the years dormitory life has become more and more liberalized, but the reduction in age of majority does not necessarily require comparable changes in the living arrangements provided by educational institutions. Rules prohibiting the use of alcoholic beverages in dormitories for educational reasons are not voided simply because a particular state permits 18-year-olds to possess alcoholic beverages (Hanson 1975, p. 35).

In conclusion, the new status of students as adults, for some purposes, seems to add a legal and a political impetus to trends already underway in the direction of student emancipation from parental or college monitoring and control. It appears also that adult status will effectively increase students' range of choice and responsibility for the consequences of their actions. Subject only to the particular needs of a college to promote an environment conducive to learning, students are being treated more and more like adults. While this trend may be only partly related to the majority laws, it is clearly an important emerging source of student influence.

## Conclusion

The sources of influence examined here are only beginning to emerge and there is room for further growth in all of the areas discussed. More students could be directly involved or supportive at more institutions in more states if there were a higher level of funding and more continuous effort. For example, organized state lobbying activity occurs only in 28 states. Collective bargaining and student involvement is only in its infancy. The full impact of the age-of-majority laws may yet reinforce much more widespread student emancipation from parental and college monitoring and control.

Another possibility is that the scope of influence may increase, that is, students may use these sources of influence to gain a broader array of ends. For example, student institutions have grown from cooperative bookstores to vast networks of cooperative enterprises and have become "neighborhood corporations" or "student conglomerates." And lobbying staffs are expanding as students seek more comprehensive coverage of issues and bills that have less obvious identification with student interests. It is worth noting that the expansion of student interests may be met with increasing resistance and could jeopardize the effectiveness of student sources of influence in the long run.

Since 1970 student interest has focused more on issues that directly affect students as students. Issues include the cost of an education—financial aid, low tuition, tax breaks on student consumer products, the cost of housing and other goods and services, and transportation costs. They also relate to the quality of education itself—student/faculty ratios, evaluation of teaching, and program and faculty retrenchment. Another interest is student freedom—the desire for increased options, and freedom from parental and college control of student lives. Finally, students have been concerned with maintaining and further institutionalizing their role in the governance of colleges and universities. This concern ranges from protecting the mandatory activity fee to seating more students on the board of trustees.

The only exception to these student-related concerns is the student-financed PIRG groups. These groups have taken up a broader slate of issues and concerns, such as environmental despoliation, consumer protection, and civil liberties in public institutions. Many

of these concerns are followed up by programs designed to institute direct social reforms. The PIRG groups appear to be the only source of influence reviewed here that represents a continuity of interest steming from the social activist concerns of the late 1960's.

This study supports the view that the various sources of influence are interconnected and often used simultaneously to reinforce each other. For example, it is not uncommon to find students doing legislative lobbying to get a collective bargaining law amended so that students can maintain or increase their role in campus governance. The likelihood of student success in these political processes is enhanced because they represent a voting constituency and in many cases are considered legal adults. At the same time students might seek relief through the courts to avoid the immediate problem of a faculty strike, or they might stage an "old-style" demonstration to dramatize their position with respect to tuition rebates if their education is interrupted. This variety of action illustrates the interconnectedness of the sources of influence and strategies for dealing at the same time with short-range needs (often defensively) and long-range interests.

Although the use of the judicial system has not been a central focus of this study, a number of examples of student use of the courts have been given. Court orders and injunctions have been sought and successfully obtained to protect student interests that were under immediate attack (for instance, in the case of faculty strikes or inordinately disruptive protest by other groups of students). The courts are also being used to interpret the meaning of the 26th Amendment and the age-of-majority laws in terms of the constitutionality of local college or community rules and regulations. This includes areas such as establishing residency for voting or tuition purposes, dormitory regulations, financial aid needs determination, and other parietals. It seems likely that students also will increasingly use legal processes for contract disputes, damage suits, and other attempts at immediate redress, or for interpretations of existing local, state, and federal laws.

It seems clear that "old-style" student protest is here to stay. But now it is being used more selectively, more rationally, and more constructively. Students have no illusions about being politically effective if they use this mode of influence exclusively. Rather, it seems that they wish to symbolize, dramatize, and publicize their concerns and perhaps to remind those who have forgotten that the impulse to use more primitive political means is still alive and potentially damaging and disruptive. But students will probably use more

sophisticated channels of influence as long as they are a viable alternative.

At least four general barriers or threats to student influence have been identified from the literature. First, conflict of interests occur with a wide variety of powerful groups: the faculty, local businesses, administrators and, inevitably, members of the state legislature. The upshot is often an attempt to undercut the financial basis for student influence by attacking the mandatory student activity fee. Students have had to continuously defend their right to tax themselves to maintain a voice at all levels of decision making. Because this "taxation" process includes some cooperation and collaboration with the colleges, this may be the Achilles' heel of student influence. To be sure, the courts have helped students maintain control of student fees and have prevented state encroachment where constitutional issues were at stake (for example, the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment).

Another barrier or limit to student influence occurs when the legitimate interests of the college as an educational institution are asserted. The courts have repeatedly upheld the right of college officials to maintain an environment conducive to learning. In practice this means that rights and choices students might enjoy as citizens in the wider society may be circumscribed within the college itself. Colleges are not popular democracies simply because 18-year-olds can vote. Even though alcohol can be consumed by students in the community it may not be permitted in the dorms. Also, some communities and states require certain tests of bona fide residency before students can enjoy the benefits of state or community support.

Another problem for students is that existing laws do not fit the model of student involvement. Statutory changes and perhaps labor law modifications must occur before student participation in collective bargaining can be accommodated. These changes may be slow to arrive and restrictive when accomplished.

Finally, student political apathy or preoccupation with academic, social, and career pursuits may make it difficult to rally student support, to encourage student patronage of student institutions, or to get student votes where they are needed. As student bodies become more and more heterogeneous in age, social class, experience, family and work commitments, and goals, the array of distinctively student interests may diminish and make it more difficult to generate student interest and support.

The general conclusion of this study is that students have de-

veloped a number of newly emerging sources of influence. These sources, while potentially quite effective, have met with a number of barriers, both on and off the college campus. The sources of influence seem to have taken two routes: students organizing separately or students participating in already existing structures and processes. The evolution of sources of influence seems to be toward more student extra-institutional political activity where students may have an advantage at this time. In an important chapter on "Organized Student Power," Epstein concludes:

> In principle and in practice, students are less disadvantaged in the state's broader political arena than they are in the university's internal governing structure. They have the same right to participate as any other citizens; and, although they constitute only a large minority of the whole community, their numbers are greater than those of other educational interest groups. They may be capable of getting the attention of politicians ordinarily pressured by smaller, more intense groups. In the larger political world students cannot be dismissed because they lack the professional qualifications of faculty and administrative staffs. The decisions of governors and legislatures, or even of regents, presumably do not require such qualifications (Epstein 1974, pp. 221-212).

Students seem to have recognized the truth of this statement. Their extra-institutional political activity has been used directly to gain specific ends (like more financial aid appropriations) but, perhaps more importantly, indirectly to gain influence through permanent and legitimate participation in the ongoing institutional decision-making processes.

## Bibliography

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education abstracts and indexes the current research literature on higher education for publication in the National Institute of Education's monthly *Resources in Education* (RIE). Readers who wish to order ERIC documents cited in the bibliography should write to the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Post Office Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210. When ordering, please specify the ERIC document (ED) number. Unless otherwise noted, documents are available in both microfiche (MF) and hard/photocopy (HC).


Altbach, Philip G. *Student Politics in America: A Historical Analysis.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Anderson, Jack. "Student Activism: Idealism is Not Dead," *The Washington Post,* September 22, 1974.

Aussieker, Bill. "Student Involvement With Collective Bargaining." Assistant Professor in Administrative Services, California State, San Bernardino, California. Unpublished manuscript, 1975.

Becker, Elizabeth. "Maryland U. Students Protest Dropping of 52 From Faculty," *The Washington Post,* March 18, 1975.

Begin, James P. "Faculty Governance and Collective Bargaining: An Early Appraisal." *The Journal of Higher Education* 45 (November 1974): 582-593.

Berlet, Chip. "Campus Activism: Students, Money and Power." In *Funding Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: National Student Association, August 1975.

———. *Student Unionization.* Washington, D.C.: National Student Association, 1975.

Bornstein, Henry E. "Residency Laws and the College Student." *Journal of Law and Education* 1 (July 1972): 349-369.

Boyd, Joseph D. and Fenske, Robert N. *A Longitudinal Study of Illinois State Scholarship Commission Monetary Award Recipients 1967-1974.* Springfield: Illinois State Scholarship Commission, June 1975. HE 006 805 (Dec. *RIE*).

Boyer, Alan E. and Astin, Alexander W. "Campus Unrest, 1970-71: Was it Really all that Quiet?" *Educational Record* (Fall 1971): 301-313.

Bucklew, Neil S. *Students and Unions.* Report 22. University Park, Pennsylvania: Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University, July 1973. ED 082 607. MF-$0.76; HC-$1.95.

Campus Notes. "Massachusetts Moratorium Protests Budget Cuts," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* May 5, 1975, p. 2.

———. "Proposed Cuts at Duke Spark Student Protest," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* March 10, 1975, p. 2.

———. "25 Protestors Arrested at Santa Barbara," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* May 12, 1975, p. 2.

Carbone, Robert F. "Future of the Low-Tuition System," *Educational Record,* Fall 1973, pp. 265-270.

———. *Students and State Borders: Fiscal/Legal Issues Affecting Nonresident Students,* ACT Special Report #7, Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1972. ED 082 678. MF-$0.76; HC-$3.32.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Dissent and Disruption,* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

———. "Student Influence on Campus and Off," *Governance of Higher Education,* New York: McGraw-Hill, April, 1973, pp. 61-72.

Chase, Dennis. "University of Wisconsin Cooperates With Student-Run Housing Co-ops," *College and University Business,* July, 1972, p. 46.

Chronister, Jay L. and Martin, E. Davis. *Nonresident Student Enrollment in State Institutions of Higher Education: An Overview,* Charlottesville, Virginia: Center for Higher Education, May 1975.

Citizen Action Group. "PIRGs: An Annual Report 1974-75." Washington, D.C.: Citizen Action Group, 1975. HE 006 808 (Dec. *RIE*).

Coe, Alan C. "The Implications of Collective Bargaining for Students and Student Personnel Administrators." *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal* 11 (October 1973): 9-18.

"Coming of Age at Ohio State," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* February 11, 1974, p. 2.

Epstein, Leon D. *Governing the University.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Fenske, Robert H., et al. "Recent Trends in Studies of Student Migration." *Journal of Higher Education* (January 1974): 61-74.

Fields, Cheryl M. "Adulthood at Age 18 Seen Straining Student Aid," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* April 8, 1974, p. 3.

———. "Adulthood at 18 Affects Colleges' Relations with Students," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* October 1, 1973, p. 3.

Guido, Kenneth J. "Student Voting and Residency Qualifications: The Aftermath of the 26th Amendment." *New York University Law Review* 47 (April 1972): 32-58.

Hanson, David J. *The Lowered Age of Majority: Its Impact on Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1975. ED 101 656. MF-$0.76; HC-Available for $2.00 from Association of American Colleges, 1818 R St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009.

Henderson, Jay. "Student Lobbying in the 1970's," Unpublished [Washington, D.C.: National Student Lobby], June 1975. HE 006 802 (Nov. *RIE*).

Hilary, Kaye. "Skirting the System: Young People Join Co-ops, Credit Unions to Defy the Establishment—and Save Themselves Money," *The Wall Street Journal,* September 8, 1971, p. 36.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Student Participation in Governance." In *The White House Conference on Youth.* Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971, pp. 39-63. ED 055 537. MF-$0.76; HC-$4.43.

"In the States: Nebraska Voters to Decide on Students as Regents," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* March 4, 1974, p. 6.

Jacobson, Robert L. "CUNY Faculty Union Encounters Hard Bargaining," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* September 25, 1972, p. 3.

———. "'Fatigue of the 70's' Has Taken Over, Say Delegates to Student Congress," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* August 28, 1972, pp. 1, 4.

Klamon. *Lobbying: A Guide for Students.* Washington, D.C.: National Student Association, August 1975.

Klotz, Neil, ed. *Students, Collective Bargaining and Unionization.* Washington, D.C.: National Student Association, 1975.

Lichtman, Jane. *Bring Your Own Bag.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1972. HE 006 785 (Nov. *RIE*).

Lipset, S. M. "How Education Affects the Youth Vote," *Saturday Review* 55 (November 1972): 68-70.

Logue, H. E., "PIRG's Clash with Trustees," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* July 7, 1975, pp. 1, 8.

Magarell, Jack. "Sit Ins At Brown, Minority Students Win Most Demands," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* May 5, 1975, p. 2.

Maguire, John W. "Changing Voter Profile and School Elections." *Intellect* 101 (November 1972): 113.

McGrath, Earl J. *Should Students Share The Power?* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1970.

McHugh, William F. "Collective Bargaining and the College Student," *Journal of Higher Education,* March 1971, pp. 175-185.

McNett, Ian. "Will Students Decide the Election?" *Change* (October 1972): 10.

Mortimer, Kenneth P. "A Survey of Experience In Academic Collective Bargaining." Paper presented at the Association of College and Research Libraries, San Francisco, California, June 26, 1975. HE 006 781 (Nov. *RIE*).

Nader, Ralph and Ross, Donald. *Action for a Change.* New York: Grossman Publishers, 1972.

National Student Lobby. *The National Student Lobby Annex Handbook.* Mimeographed. Washington, D.C.: National Student Lobby, n.d.

———. *The National Student Lobby State Lobby Handbook.* Mimeographed. Washington, D.C.: National Student Lobby, n.d.

"On the Campuses: 14% of Colleges Have Students as Trustees," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* November 13, 1972, p. 1.

Orze, Joseph J. "Student Involvement in Collective Bargaining Is 'Here to Stay' at Southeastern Massachusetts U." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* April 22, 1974, p. 11. Letter to the editor.

"Parents Pay Less . . . and Students More, Study Finds," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* April 7, 1975, p. 6.

Pitts, Jesse R. "Strike at Oakland University." *Change* 4 (February 1972): 16-19.

"Private College Students Organize in Minnesota," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* October 29, 1974, p. 2.

Report of the Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee (Coleman Report No. 2). *Youth: Transition to Adulthood.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Rossman, Michael. "Alternatives to the Status Quo: Education at Sanctum." *Change* 6 (March 1974): 30-35.

Scully, Malcolm G. "Britain's Militant, Leftist Union of Students," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* May 12, 1975, p. 7.

Semas, Philip W. "Antioch College May Call It a 'Learning Experience,' But, Whatever the Name, It's a Serious Student Strike," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* May 21, 1973, p. 1.

———. "Antioch Fires Teachers, Expels Students Who Barred Officials from Buildings," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* May 29, 1973, p. 4.

———. "College Replaces Strikers, Finds It Has Two Faculties," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 14, 1973, p. 5.

———. "Law Officers Open Antioch, Ending 6-Week Strike," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 18, 1973, p. 6.

———. "Laws on Faculty Bargaining," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 31, 1975, p. 1, 8.

———. "Student Lobbyists Showing a New Sophistication," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 12, 1973, p. 5.

———. "Student Sits on Administration Side of Table in Bargaining with Faculty at Ferris State," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, December 10, 1973, p. 12.

———. "Students Consider Own Bargaining Role as Faculty Units Dominate Key Issues," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 30, 1973, p. 4.

———. "Students' Role in Faculty Bargaining in Jeopardy in Mass.," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 1, 1974, p. 3.

———. "Three Colleges Settle Strikes," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 24, 1973, p. 3.

Senia, Al. "The New Student Activists." *Change* 6 (October 1974): 29-33.

Shark, Alan R. "Current Status of College Students in Academic Collective Bargaining." Special Report No. 22. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, July 1975, pp. 1-10. HE 006 784 (Nov. *RIE*).

———. "The Educational Consumer and Academic Collective Bargaining." *Liberal Education* 6 (May 1975): 261-267.

———. "The Students' Right to Collective Bargaining." *Change* 5 (April 1973): 9-10, 62.

Shaw, Paul C. "The Urban University Student: A Political Profile." *Research in Higher Education* 2 (March 1974): 65-79.

Shulman, Carol H. "Resident Tuition and Student Migration: Some Recent Problems." *Research Currents*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, February 1974. ED 086 077. MF-$0.76; HC-$1.58.

Sievert, William A. and Weidlin, Edward R., "Beneath the Surface Calm: What?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (Special Report: Student Activism, 1972), March 13, 1972.

Spiegel, Robert H. "No. 1 Student Lobbyist: A Big Man on Campus." *Wisconsin State Journal*, December 29, 1974, p. 2.

"States Raise Aid to Students 25%," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 18, 1974, p. 1.

"Student Interest in Advocacy Groups Grows," *Chemical and Engineering News* 50 (January 3, 1972): 19, 22-23.

*Student Lobbyist*. Washington, D.C.: National Student Lobby, April-May 1975.

"Student Vote in College Towns Suffers Setback in New York Court," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 25, 1972, p. 2.

"Students Get Role in Teacher Negotiations," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 7, 1975, p. 4.

"Students Testify on Aid Before House Committee," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 4, 1974, p. 4.

"Students Will Join Faculty Bargaining," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 15, 1973, pp. 1, 6.

"Students Win Two Court Cases on Voter Registration," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 6, 1972, p. 4.

"The Student Lobbyists." *Time* 102 (September 24, 1973): 60.

Thurber, James A. "Some Causes and Consequences of Student Political Participation." *Youth and Society* (December 1973): 242-256.

"Two Courts Back Student Voting in College Towns," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 16, 1972, p. 4.

Van Dyne, Larry, "Michigan Students Protest Tuition Increases—but Most Pay," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 12, 1973, p. 5.

———. "Student Lobbyists Shift Emphasis," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 15, 1974, p. 1.

Wahle, Chris. "Who Are Sacramento's Most Influential Lobbyists?" *California Journal* (September 1974): 293-296.

Weidlin, Edward R., "Apathy Slows Nader Groups," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 19, 1973, pp. 1, 4.

Wise, W. Max. "The Student Corporation: A New Prospect for American Colleges and Universities." *Journal of Higher Education* 44 (January 1973): 27-40.

Woodruff, Kevin and Fuller, Bruce. *Student Vote 1974: An Analysis of Student Voting Patterns in the June, 1974, Primary Election*. Sacramento, California: University of California Student Lobby, August 1974. ED 095 752. MF-$0.76; HC-$1.95.